1.00 P.M.

बात से सिद्ध होता है कि पिछले वर्ष के राष्ट्रीय औसत 45 लाख प्रति जिला रोज़गार दिवस सृ ...रने के विरुद्ध इन 3 जिलों में 231 लाख प्रति जिला रोज़गार दिवस सृजित किए गए हैं।

हाल ही में अल्पावधि पलायन के आकस्मिक प्रभाव के अध्ययन से यह परिणाम निकला है कि इन लोगों के जीवन-निर्वाह के लिए उक्त योजना की रोजगार सीमावधि में वृद्धि अनिवार्य है।

देश के अन्य राज्यों में भी जनजातीय क्षेत्रों में ऐसी ही स्थिति हो सकती है। चूँकि रोजी-रोटी के लिए गाँवों से शहरों की ओर पलायन रोकना और साधनहीन को रोज़गार देना इस योजना का मुख्य उद्देश्य है, अतः मैं माँग करता हूँ कि जनजाति के लोगों के लिए रोज़गार उपलब्ध कराने की सीमा को बढ़ा कर 200 दिवस कर दी जाए।

Need to use electronic mail to communicate courts' judgements

SHRI SHANTARAM LAXMAN NAIK (Goa): Sir, liberty of an individual being of utmost importance is enshrined in the Constitution of India as a fundamental right. This liberty cannot be taken away except according to the law of the land.

Now-a-days, it is seen that convicts are not getting copies of judgements and, as a result of which, valuable rights of citizens to seek further remedies is delayed and, many a time convicts remain in jail for not being able to file appeals/revisions and seek bail. Further, it has also been seen that after convicts obtain bail, they remain in jail on account of non-communication of the release orders to the jail authorities.

Sir, when the Government is very keen to increase the speed of IT revolution in the country, and when e-governance is being given top priority and when judiciary is also using internet system to a large extent by opening web-sites of various courts, it would have been fit and proper that judgements and orders, where liberty of individuals is concerned, communication of judgements and orders through e-mails, would have been most ideal.

It is, therefore, essential that all the jails in this country should have compute systems to receive electronic mail, and computers installed therein should have fax receiving software, if not separate fax machines.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): The House stands adjourned to meet at 2.00 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at *one minute past one of the clock.*

The House re-assembled, after lunch, at two of the clock

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION
Indo-U.S. Nuclear Deal

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY (West Bengal): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, for giving me this opportunity. I am very glad that this discussion is finally taking place. We had hoped that this discussion would have taken place in the last Session, but, unfortunately, due to the disruptions we had, we could not do so. But like we say in Hindustani, 'देर आए, दुरुस्त आए', बहस तो हो रही है।

Sir, this is the third occasion that I am rising on this issue. We have had two detailed discussions in the House and much of the arguments which we hold in our opposition to this Indo-U.S. nuclear deal have been said and I will try my best not to repeat those arguments that I have stated earlier.

But, Sir, I would only like to recapitulate very briefly that in the first debate that we have had here, the Prime Minister was kind enough to accept the nine assurances that we sought

from him and, at that stage, I remember I had stated that we would be willing to accept those as the sense of the House. At that time, the Hyde Act was not passed by the U.S. Congress. Subsequently, when the Hyde Act was passed, we had another debate in December and in the conclusion of that debate the Prime Minister had categorically assured that (a) they would come back to the House before the 123 agreement was finalised or frozen, and (b) none of the assurances that were made would be violated and the Government would stand by all the assurances that had been given. But, unfortunately, Sir, the assurances the Prime Minister had given, at least on three counts, we think, have been violated in the 123 agreement text. I would come to that subsequently. But, since they have been violated, I would only urge upon the Government not to proceed on this deal not only because of our opposition or the opposition from the other sections of this House but also because it is in violation of the Prime Minister's own assurances to the House, which I hold as the most sacrosanct and I do not think that those can be violated. Therefore, we urge the Government not to proceed further on this deal because of this important reason.

Secondly, Sir, before I come to the content of why I am making this assertion that the Government should not proceed, I would also touch upon the fact that much has already been said and stated that our opposition to this deal stems from our ideological perception of being anti-American. I would like to set the record straight. Sir, it is not that we are anti-American. In fact, on the contrary, we are not anti-American people; but, I think, we are pro-American people because 61 per cent of the American people, in the latest opinion poll, have said that they do not endorse and they are not with the Bush Administration's or the present Government's policies in the U.S.A. So, we are with the American people and not with the Administration and we are anti-American imperialism and not anti-American or anti-American people.

Secondly, Sir, also, I would like to clarify that much is also made out that our opposition stems from an extra-territorial loyalty. I have gone on record in this House, it is there in the proceedings, that we take our decisions and our positions purely and entirely on the basis of what we perceive as India's national interest. And it is on that basis we are saying that this deal is not in the interest of India. I would come to the details of why I am saying so a little later. But, this is not on any so-called extra-territorial loyalty. We have stated very clearly that even if China were to endorse this deal, we would still continue to oppose this deal because we think this is not in India's interest and, therefore, I want to make this clear again before I come to the actual details of why we are opposing this deal.

Having said this, I would like to discuss this deal, as I said, without repeating what we have said on the two earlier occasions in the context of the pretext for the deal, the context of the deal, the text of the deal and, of course, the sub-text of the deal which I will try and elaborate.

First, let us take up the pretext. What we have been told is that this deal is absolutely essential for India's energy security. If I may say so, on the last occasion, I had read out to this House the Planning Commission's assessment on our energy scenario and this was also read out subsequently by various other participants. So, I do not want to repeat that.

But on the point of India's energy security, we have to bear in mind the following. India's current power generation is 127 Giga Watts. At the current rate of the GDP growth, this needs to grow to 337 GW by 2016-17. There is no doubt that if this is not achieved, India's pace of development would be arrested. The moot question, however, is whether nuclear energy expansion is the only or the best option that we have today. In 2006, 3.9 GW of nuclear power

was generated, that is, 3 per cent of our total power generation. In the most optimistic scenario, the Planning Commission estimates that this could grow at best to 20 GW by 2016, over just over 6 per cent of our production at that point of time. So, all this is happening for that 6 per cent and for this 6 per cent are we and should we today sacrifice and mortgage our, what we believe, sovereignty, and in that sense be vulnerable to pressures from US imperialism. Further, Sir, given the abundance of coal reserves in India, the Planning Commission estimates that thermal energy would dominate power generation in India, and as far as hydro electricity is concerned, given the potential of nearly 150 GW, we have today only installed capacity of 33 GW. A huge untapped potential exists in hydro electricity. Now we have discovered large quantities of gas in the country and that option is also available apart from solar and wind options. So, has there been cost benefit analysis done by any agency of the Government on how and why we are preferring this nuclear option? Why I am saying this, Sir, is also because of the cost of it. It is often said that this 123 does not relate to the *aam aadmi* or it does not relate actually to the future of India, of the Indian people. Just consider the following. The estimates have told us or show us that the nuclear power being used for energy production is most expensive of all options. The Prime Minister himself has publicly said that we are targeting, say, 40,000 MW to be produced by nuclear energy by 2020 and 2025. Out of this 40,000 let us presume 10,000 MW would come from our own domestic reactors, that leaves 30,000 that need to be generated from nuclear energy and if this 30,000 MW is generated through imported nuclear reactors, the cost estimation for every MW will be 11 crores of rupees, that is, for this 30,000 we will be spending 3,30,000 crores of rupees. The same 30,000 MW if we produce through thermal energy it will be 4 crores per MW and the same if we produce through hydro-electricity or through gas, it will be 3 crores per MW. So, the cost differential is something of the tune of two lakh crores plus. Now if this two lakh crores plus was used in the field of education, we can build new 2.5 lakh Navodaya Vidyalayas in our country. Sir, 100 students can on scholarship be educated up to Class XII, that is, the cost differential can educate 2.5 crore Indian boys and girls and give them quality education which we are foregoing because of using this most costly option. Out of the same amount of money, if you spend on health, you can create 20,000, hundred-bed hospitals, quality hospitals in this country and meet the health needs of our population. The question is why are we going for this expensive option at the expense of keeping our children illiterate, at the expense of not treating those people who require health attention? Why are we going in for such an expensive option? This is something for which there is no clear answer so far. The other pretext that is given, Sir, so, I think in terms of cost benefit analysis this is the most expensive option we have and as a result of this most expensive option we are denying the *aam aadmi* whatever we could have given to him because whenever we say some issues of people's welfare must be taken up, there is always this argument that there is a resource constraint. If there is a resource constraint, why are we using our scarce resources to satisfy, let us say, the orders to multinational corporations in one country, which has not installed a new nuclear power reactor in the last two decades? The USA does not install them but it wants to sell their nuclear reactors to us. So, we end up buying their nuclear reactors and generating profit for them while, in our own country we deprive our own children from going to school and getting quality education or our own elderly senior citizens from getting quality health attention. Now, this is something not permissible if we want a real modern prosperous India. So, from that point of view, I think, this is a very big folly that we will be entering into, and, I think, there must be a re-think done by the Government on this score. The other pretext also, Sir they say, is that if we enter the deal, then, we will be breaking the nuclear apartheid that is there on India or that we will be sitting on the nuclear high table of

the world. I will come to that later, Sir, because all these are illusions. This is an illusory claim. If you go through the text and sub-text of the 123, then, you will. See that this is an illusory claim. Therefore, the pretext for going into this deal, in my opinion, is very faulty and in fact, it is something that cannot substantiate the need for us to enter into such a deal.

If that is the case, Sir, then what is the context in which we have to see this deal? The deal, Sir, is not only to be seen in terms of nuclear commerce or the nuclear benefit that is generally being propagated. We have the Under Secretary of State of the United States of America who has gone on record to state that there are at least four related benefits to this agreement as well. The first concerns non-proliferation. I am quoting, Sir, "For 30 years, India has been on the outside of that system, of non-proliferation. With this agreement, India will open up its system to international inspection and it puts the majority of its civilian reactors under IAEA safeguards. This deal now brings India back into the non-proliferation mainstream in a way it was not before." If this is the US claim, Sir, and this is what they want to bring us into, the non-proliferation regime through the backdoor, then, all the principled positions that the Government of India has taken all along, which we have supported, that we will not sign the NPT because it is a discriminatory treaty, all that, falls flat. So, we think that there is a larger design that is involved in this deal. The next benefit that he talks about is on the position of, and I quote, "The agreement also sends an important message to nuclear outlaw regimes such as Iran" and that is the fact that we have already mentioned a number of times and the Hyde Act refers to Iran and our foreign policy positions which have to congruent with what the US position will be. The third related benefit he talks about is the fact of military cooperation and of military sales. As much as they are interested in 123, Sir, in no unambiguous terms he talks of great military commerce with India and their target is 126 and not 123. And 126 is the number of combat aircraft, the military aircraft, that we are going to buy and they are hoping through this deal that they will cement India into a closer military cooperation. This, again, being the case, Sir, what we are now entering into, in my opinion, is a deal which actually takes India closer to the US positions on global issues as well as on regional strategic concerns; and what is being done is to drag India into or suck India into the vortex of being a subordinate ally of United States of America; and it is this subordinate ally status which we think is not in India's interest at the present moment. Why it is so, I will come to later. But the fact remains that this is something which we cannot afford to do now. I will, Sir, if time permits, also refer to certain very derogatory things that have been said about us and about our former Prime Ministers by the US Under Secretary of State. I am quoting, Sir. "The benefits of these historic agreements are very real for the United States. For the first time in three decades, India will submit its entire nuclear programme for international inspections etc." Secondly, he says that, "If India were to conduct a nuclear test, the United States would have the right under US laws to seek the return of all nuclear fuel and technology... Shipped by US firms." That apart, the important point on our foreign policy issue is, "This Agreement will also send a powerful message to nuclear outlays like Iran. If you play by the rules as India has, you will be rewarded..." — Please underline the word 'rewarded' — "...If you do not, you will face sanctions and isolation." So, this is the clear message that the US's Official Spokesman is saying that India is being rewarded for being, as they said, 'playing by the rules.' And, who defines the rules — the United States of America. You play by their rules, you will be rewarded. If you do not play by their rules, you will not be rewarded like Iran. That is why we have these apprehensions. In the present context, if you look at the pressures that are put on India, unfortunately, we think that these pressures are already at work. When the Hyde Act talks of Indian Foreign Policy being congruent with that of the United States of

America, where it refers, on three occasions to Iran, they expect India to toe that line. We have seen in the past on our votes in the IAEA. I am not going into that. We had discussed that earlier. But, now, what do we see? The trilateral meeting between Iran, Pakistan and India on the Iranian Gas Pipeline which we say is very necessary for us, for our energy augmentation, the same argument that is given for this nuclear deal, the same argument for energy augmentation and it is a cheaper option, but, then, you have not attended that meeting. You had not gone there. Why? The answer needs to be given. Is it under the US pressure? The UN has imposed some sanctions on Iran. But, the US has extended and gone ahead and imposed certain unilateral sanctions on Iran beyond the UN sanctions. We are not obliged to accept the US sanctions. But, yet, last week, your SBI denies the lines of credit to Iranian firms which want to import goods from India to Iran and you are not even permitting these exports to take place, because you have not permitted them. Why? Again, under the US pressure! There is an Indian corporate house which has a multibillion dollar joint venture to be set up in Iran and they have now withdrawn from that. Why? It is under American pressure. If they do that, then their joint venture in the USA will suffer. So, all these are clear indications that we are already succumbing to these pressures when we need not succumb to the US pressures at all or US sanctions on Iran. But, we are doing this. And, this is sending a very, very serious ominous signal to what will be the future of our country's foreign policy. In this context, I would also like to state that there is a domestic context, since I am talking of the context, also which we cannot, today, ignore. All of us are being told that this nuclear deal that has happened is not certainly a flash in the pan, but is a part of overall growing relationship between India and the United States of America. Yes, Sir. We also recognise, after all, I agree with that point, and we also recognise the architecture for the present strategic alliance was laid under the NDA rule in their past six years. Though military cooperation with the USA began under the Narasimha Rao Government, but it was only after 1998 that a lot of this arehitecture of a strategic alliance with the USA had actually started. I was listening, with a great respect, to the intervention of the hon. Leader of the Opposition this morning when he had expected the hon. Ministers who travelled abroad to come and explain to the House what happened in those visits. But, Sir, he has had these rounds of discussions personally with Mr. Strobe Talbot which we were informed by that gentleman and nobody else here. But, anyway, that is a different story. I am not going into that. But, what I am really concerned is that we were the first ones to have in 2000 welcomed the US National Defence Programme. In fact, the former Prime Minister articulates that India should be treated as US's natural ally. And, after the 9/11, we had written and offered our cooperation in the US war against terrorism or global war against terrorism and, to the extent, when the USA choose Pakistan, instead of India, the then Dy. Prime Minister, which is on record, says that, in fact, demoaned 'This is the logic of geography' and it was because of this logic that the USA chooses Pakistan, not India. But, in any case, is entire process, is important to note. Why? I will just come to that. In 2002, Bush Administration adopted a national security strategy. This stated, "The US has undertaken a transformation in its bilateral relationship with India, based on a conviction that US' interests require a strong relationship with India." Then, followed the next round of talks with them, which extended cooperation in space, nuclear, high technology and missile defence fields. So, this background, we understand, Sir, is the architecture because of which the deal has come. Our point of view is the following. We have extended support to the UPA Government precisely because, in our understanding, we wanted to keep, what we define as communal forces, away from power. But this support was based on a Common Minimum Programme. In that Common Minimum Programme, we have defined what will be our Foreign Policy direction; where it stated clearly that India will pursue an independent

Foreign Policy, while strengthening relations with all countries, including the USA. There was no mention of any nuclear agreement in that. There was no mention of any strategic alliance in the Common Minimum Programme. Therefore, our support is based on the Common Minimum Programme. Our support to the UPA is based on the fact that we do not want the communal forces to be in power. But we cannot allow the UPA Government to proceed to complete the agenda that was begun by the NDA Government, and that runs completely contrary to the basis of our support. Therefore, our appeal is that do not get into this situation, on an issue that is not there in the agreed Common Minimum Programme. And, if is not there in the Common Minimum Programme, we say that we are opposing this precisely also on that count and do not enlarge the agenda which has not been agreed upon. Therefore, do not take India on a course where we will end up being a subordinate ally of the United States of America.

Now, Sir, come to the text of the Agreement. In the text of the Agreement, this 123 Agreement is very clearly anchored within the Hyde Act. And, this is not that I am saying so; this is the US Secretary of State who says it very clearly, I quote, "We had to make sure that everything in this US-India Civil Nuclear Agreement, the 123 Agreement, was completely consistent with the Hyde Act and well within the bounds of Hyde Act itself." This is their own statement. I had discussed the Hyde Act and its implications in the last debate. We had discussed about how various extraneous issues, through which the USA is imposing conditions on us. We have also discussed the fact that the US President has, on occasions, stated that many things stated in the Hyde Act were not mandatory for him to follow. But, then, remember every US President has a right to decide on this. If, once this President goes and another President comes in and says, "Yes, I abide by what is being said in the Hyde Act", all those provisions can be invoked against India. Let us not be under any illusion that the present President is a great friend of India; therefore, being a great friend of India he has said that these are not applicable, or he is not mandated to follow these provisions, which would be an illusion. But, then, in a lighter vein and with due respect, please remember that all those who had considered George Bush as a good friend — the Prime Minister of Britain, the Prime Minister of Australia, the Prime Minister of Japan, the Government in Italy — many of them have met a fate that we don't want our Prime Minister, or, this Government to meet. We are supporting this Government; we want to support this Government. But, I do not want this fate to befall this Government. Therefore, I ask this Government to seriously reconsider this deal and not proceed ahead.*(Interruptions)*

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI (Uttar Pradesh): If they proceed ahead, what will you do? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI N. JOTHI (Tamil Nadu): What will you do, if they proceed ahead? *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: No; no, please. *(Interruptions)* Mr. Trivedi, please sit down. *(Interruptions)* Please allow Mr. Yechuri to speak. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I entirely understand the eagerness of Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi and Mr. Jothi, who think riding on our shoulders, they will get an opportunity to come and sit here. *(Interruptions)* We will not permit that ever. ...*(Interruptions)*... You please understand; that it will not be permitted ever. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI: That means, supporting this Government is more important for you than to oppose this deal. This is clear.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, my agenda is ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the agenda of my party; the CPI (M)...*(Interruptions)*... For me and my party this agenda

that is most important is that this nuclear deal should not be implemented. My agenda is not on the Government, whether it should stay or not. I want the Government to stay. I want this nuclear deal not to happen and that is the stated position of our party. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How much more time do you require, Mr. Yechury? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: It depends on the interruptions, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*... I am sorry to say, but, it is up to you. Sir, since you have reminded me of the time, I only want to say why this 123 Agreement is rooted in the Hyde Act. Article 2.1 of the 123 Agreement states, "Each party shall implement this Agreement in accordance with its respective applicable treaties, national laws, regulations, and licence requirements concerning the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes."

Now the question is, the respective national law for the United States America is the Hyde Act. Now, you cannot, therefore, be under the illusion that once the 123 Agreement has come, the 123 has superseded the Hyde Act. The U.S. itself is very clear saying that 123 Agreement is within the Hyde Act, and it is anchored in the Hyde Act. Having done so, it would be a very, very dangerous illusion to think that these provisions of the Hyde Act are not applicable to us.

But, having said that, Sir, in the 123 Agreement itself there are three assurances which the hon. Prime Minister gave to this House, which I accepted, and we all accepted, but, which, I do not think, are met.

The first one concerns the uninterrupted fuel supplies. Yes, the 123 Agreement talks of uninterrupted fuel supplies till the life of the reactors. But, once the 123 Agreement is terminated, which can be done under the Hyde Act by any U.S. President who may come in the future, once that is done, the Hyde Act is very clear, it says that the moment 123 Agreement is terminated, supplies will stop. Not only will supplies stop, but the United States of America will work with all its allies to ensure nobody else supplies to us. And, that is also written in black and white. So, why are we going into an agreement where we buy those reactors at a cost, which I already explained? We will have them with us, but we don't get the fuel. They threaten to take back those reactors also; bodily lift them and take them back. How is it that we are entering into an agreement which it violates the Prime Minster's own assurance that we will have uninterrupted fuel supplies.

The second assurance that the Prime Minister gave is that we will have full nuclear civilian cooperation. It is very clearly stated in section 5 of the 123 Agreement that certain dual use technologies are barred from being transferred to India; whether it is on reprocessing, enrichment or heavy water. Okay, heavy water, we say that we are ourselves capable. We have enough of it here. We are, in fact, exporting heavy water. But, in any case, why should we be under any restrictive clauses saying that they will not be transferred to us unless this agreement is further amended? And the full nuclear cooperation clause, which the hon. Prime Minister assured us here, even that is not going to be fulfilled according to this text.

The third assurance is this. The hon. Prime Minister said that everything should be done on the basis of reciprocity. This is the word used by the hon. Prime Minister. You are going to the IAEA for talks now. You are going into talks for saying that you will put your nuclear reactors under safeguards in perpetuity. But, we have just seen, the 123 Agreement can be terminated upon the will and whim of the U.S. President. If that is the case, if that can be terminated, why should India be subjected to a perpetual safeguards by the International Atomic Energy? If 123 is terminated, then, this also ought to be terminated. That reciprocity

must be valued, and must be upheld, and, therefore, even this is violated. So, on the question of uninterrupted fuel supplies, on the question of full civilian nuclear cooperation, and on the question of reciprocity, on these three counts; the three assurances that the hon. Prime Minister had given, this deal does not allow India to even uphold what the hon. Prime Minister stated in this House, when he gave the assurances to the nation.

Therefore, Sir, this is as far as the text is concerned. Sir, you have seen the pre-text, you have seen the context, and you have seen the text. On all these three, this deal does not stand. One of the most important issues is: does it benefit our country or not? Sir, I just want to take two minutes if you permit me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: The question, normally, being asked is: Why did we 'allow' the Government? I don't like to use this word; it is not that the Government should be allowed or disallowed. But, why is it that we agreed, let us say, to the Government proceeding to the IAEA when we first said that it should not be operationalised, that is, 'do not proceed to IAEA.' It is a very simple point which I want to answer, because a lot of people have expressed their surprise. Earlier, Sir, going to the IAEA for safeguards discussion and an agreement with the IAEA meant that post-IAEA, the Nuclear Deal was on autopilot. After that it would go to the NSG where we are not members. Then it would go to the US Congress, and it will return to us only after everything was completed, for the final approval of the Cabinet. That is why, we said, "Do not proceed to the IAEA; otherwise, after that, there is no way we can control it.' Now, we are happy and we gracefully accept the fact that the Government has agreed that they will go to the IAEA, they will negotiate and see if these three assurances that the Prime Minister has given, which, today, are blatantly violated, can be extracted and without even putting their initials on anything, they will come back to the country, and, then, on the basis of that, further steps will be taken. So, that is the change that has happened, where the Government has now agreed that it will come back before even putting the initials, and, therefore, we agreed and cooperated saying, 'Yes, please proceed ahead'. But the point at issue is, Sir, we still continue to remain firm; we would want this deal not to go through, in the interests of India, and for the various reasons that I have elaborated earlier.

There is also another important reason, Sir, the last one, which I would like to touch upon, that is, the question of our indigenous nuclear science development. All of us know, Sir, India is a country, which has one of the largest known deposits of thorium. All of us know that our scientists are battling against all odds and served the country so brilliantly in the past, are continuing to do their research in, actually, moving towards using thorium as a fuel for our nuclear energy. Now, we want to reach the stage of using thorium for nuclear energy purposes. Now, all of us know, particularly, those who have done science, that in the transition, from using uranium towards using thorium, there is another intermediate stage that comes where plutonium is also used to a certain extent. Now, when you have a Uranium-Plutonium cycle, which will lead up to thorium cycle, the moment plutonium comes into the picture, plutonium as an input also goes into nuclear weapons. There are international safeguards you have submitted yourselves to; the moment you reach the stage of plutonium, anybody can raise his finger and say, 'Plutonium is generated, you are transferring this to use for your nuclear weapons; and, therefore, the safeguards will apply.' You subject yourselves to international inspections, including the US inspections. I suspect and we firmly believe that there is an international effort to try and ensure that India does not reach that stage where we can use

thorium as nuclear fuel. If we reach that stage of using thorium as nuclear fuel, then, no country in the world can bulldoze or browbeat us; we are completely independent. So, it is in our interest to reach that stage, and, therefore, it is in our interest not to accept any conditions, not to accept any conditions which will not allow us to reach that stage. Therefore, we are not against nuclear energy, we are not against nuclear power. Two generations down the line, our coal will be exhausted, your bio-fuels will be exhausted, nuclear energy may be the only option, and, maybe, the only clean option. But, the point at issue is, nuclear energy now, at what cost? At what cost economically, what cost to our country's sovereignty, what cost of other pressures that we are going to expose ourselves to, the sort of vulnerablity that we are going to expose ourselves to. We all are seeing what are the activities that the US imperialism is conducting in the world today. I don't want to repeat it; we have done that in the past. All of us, today, have also seen how the hegemonic tendency of the US imperialism is expressing itself in browbeating all other countries into submission into following them. And, what are they attempting to do? Sir. To put it in a nutshell, the world, after the bi-polarity of the cold war period, is moving towards multi-polarity in international relations. It is this movement towards multi-polarity that is being subverted and sabotaged by US imperialism, which wants to convert this world into a unipolar world under its tutelage. India cannot be party to this effort. India cannot be party to an effort where unipolarity is going to be imposed under the US imperialism's hegemony. That is why, I would like to urge upon the Government to seriously reconsider the path that they are following. Hold talks with the IAEA, come back and let us reconsider this. The hon. Prime Minister has himself stated in this House in the past that before they take any further step, they would come back to the Parliament. This is a very healthy trend and we hope that that tradition will be maintained. Though it didn't happen before the 123 Agreement was initialised, nevertheless, subsequently, Government agreed to continue with this discussion. I hope that will be done and they would not take any hasty measures to rush into this deed.

Sir, my respected colleague, Jayaji, has passed on a note to me. I would like to end with this quote of Woodrow Wilson. It says, "I would rather lose a cause that will some day win than win a cause that will some day lose". And this is a cause that will lose, Sir. We cannot allow this agreement to go through, primarily, in the interests of our country, the future of our country, the future of our younger generation. Fifty-four per cent of India is below the age of 25 years. Give them education; don't spend money on profits for multi-national corporations. Give them health; don't spend money on profits for multi-national corporations. Produce the same electricity using your coal, your water, your gas, your heat and sun and your winds, and then, generate the jobs in India for all of us. And it is on the shoulders of this 54 per cent youth under the age of 25 that a new India will be built. It is for that new India that you must build your youngsters today. Invest in your youth; do not invest on profits for multi-national corporations.

With that appeal, Sir, I would once again urge upon this Government to give a serious rethink to this entire deal and to stop it now, before it is too late and we become victims of blandishment, which our country cannot and will not ever want to be.

Finally, Sir, *...(Interruptions)*...I wanted to quote something to you. There was a very unsavoury comment by the US Under Secretary of State saying that so long as Mr. Nehru was the Prime Minister and India's autocratic Nehruvian policy of Non-alignment was there, this great vision of an Indo-US strategic alliance could not have ever unfolded. Now that Nehru is not there, now that Non-alignment of the past is not there, now that all that is not there, is the Congress Party giving up its own legacies? It is the US Under Secretary of State

saying this. I do not want to give up the legacy, Sir, because I think that was a joint inherited legacy of our nation in terms of foreign policy. We have all held a consensual opinion on our foreign policy and, therefore, let us together build a resurgent India by investing in our youth. This is our appeal, Sir, and we want, therefore, through you, the Government to reconsider this and not proceed on this deal any further.

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा (झारखंड) : धन्यवाद उपसभापति महोदय। मैं आपके प्रति अपना आभार व्यक्त करना चाहता हूँ कि इस डिबेट में कम-से-कम भारतीय जनता पार्टी को आपने दूसरे नम्बर पर बोलने का अधिकार दिया है।

उपसभापति महोदय, हाल के वर्षों में शायद किसी भी सरकार का कोई एक काम, हाल के वर्षों में किसी भी सरकार का कोई एक प्रस्ताव इतना विवादास्पद नहीं बना है, जितना कि यह भारत-अमेरिका परमाणु समझौता बन गया। अब मैं यह तो दावा नहीं कर सकता हूँ कि मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी जैसा बुद्धिमान हूँ, मैं यह भी दावा नहीं कर सकता हूँ कि मैं आज जो कुछ हूँ, वह किसी विदेशी विश्वविद्यालय में पढ़ने के चलते हूँ। यह मैं दावा नहीं करता हूँ। लेकिन यदि कोई मेरी देश-भक्ति के ऊपर प्रश्न-चिह्न लगाएगा तो उससे मैं बहुत झगड़ा करूंगा।

उपसभापति महोदय, मुझे अफसोस है कि यह पूरा मामला जो हम लोगों के सामने है, इसमें राजनैतिक दलों की बात छोड़ दीजिए, सरकार के मंत्रियों की बात छोड़ दीजिए, सरकारी पदाधिकारी भी इस विवाद में शामिल हो गए हैं। अब हमारी जो Privileges Committee है, उसने यूएस में हमारे जो एम्बैसडर हैं, उनको एक चेतावनी दे कर छोड़ दिया। लेकिन उस प्रकार की टिप्पणी सदस्यों के बारे में आना कितना आपत्तिजनक है, मेरे बारे में व्यक्तिगत रूप से यह टिप्पणी आना कि मैं बिना पढ़े बोल देता हूं, यह कितनी आपत्तिजनक बात है, इस पर आप स्वयं विचार कर सकते हैं।

उपसभापति महोदय, जहां तक भारतीय जनता पार्टी का प्रश्न है, इस पर बहुत चर्चा हुई कि हमारा जो स्टैंड है, वह बदल रहा है, हमने यू टर्न कर लिया है और जान-बूझ कर यह प्रचार किया गया। केवल हमारे बारे में ही नहीं, हमारे वामपंथी मित्रों के बारे में भी यह प्रचार हुआ, साथ ही अन्य कई लोगों के बारे में यह प्रचार हुआ। हमारे समाजवादी पार्टी के नेता यहां बैठे हुए हैं, उनके बारे में भी यह प्रचार हुआ और भी कई लोगों के बारे में यह प्रचार होता है कि ये बदल गए हैं और इनका जो विरोध था, वह कमजोर हो गया है। इसके पीछे एक साजिश है, एक चाल है। मैं पूरे विश्वास के साथ यह कहना चाहता हूं कि भारतीय जनता पार्टी का जो स्टैंड शुरू में था, आज भी वही स्टैंड है।

मैं इस सदन को याद दिलाना चाहता हूं कि 4 अगस्त, 2005 में इसी सदन में इस डील के ऊपर सबसे पहले चर्चा हुई थी और उस समय हमारे दल की उप-नेता, श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज ने उस चर्चा में भाग लेते हुए प्रधान मंत्री जी को यह कहा था कि यह इंडो-यूएस न्यूक्लियर डील एक भयंकर भूल है। आज भी हम उसी राय पर कायम हैं कि यह एक भयंकर भूल है और सरकार जितनी जल्दी अपने कदमों को इससे वापस खींचती है, उतना ही उनके लिए और देश के लिए हितकारी होगा।

हमारी चिंताएं क्या हैं? प्रमुख रूप से हमारी तीन चिंताएं हैं। हमारी एक चिंता, हमारा जो न्यूक्लियर डेटरेंट है, परमाणु हथियारों का जो कार्यक्रम है, उसके बारे में है। हमारी दूसरी चिंता विदेश नीति की स्वतंत्रता के बारे में है और हमारी तीसरी चिंता, जो हमारी परमाणु नीति है, उसकी स्वतंत्रता के बारे में है।

परमाणु हथियार की जो बात हम करते हैं, सारा सदन और सारा देश इस बात को समझता है कि यह सिर्फ संख्या का सवाल नहीं है कि आपके पास कितने बम हैं, यह गुणवत्ता का भी सवाल है और यह Technical Excellence and Quality का भी सवाल है। मैं यहां यह स्पष्ट करना चाहूंगा कि जहां तक परमाणु हथियारों के कार्यक्रम का सवाल है, जिसमें हिम्मत करके मई, 1998 में हमने दुनिया के सामने यह घोषणा की कि हम एक परमाणु हथियार से सम्पन्न देश हैं, उस कार्यक्रम में न वामपंथी मित्रों को कोई रुचि है और शायद न ही हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी को कोई रुचि है। क्योंकि जब मई, 1998 में इसके ऊपर चर्चा हुई थी तो प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी इसका विरोध किया था और हमारे वामपंथी मित्रों ने भी इसका विरोध किया था।

उपसभापति महोदय, यह महज कोई इत्तिफाक नहीं है कि आज 4 दिसम्बर को हम लोग यहां पर इसकी चर्चा कर रहे हैं, क्योंकि 4 दिसम्बर, 1964 को पटना में, उस समय जो जनसंघ था, उसका अधिवेशन हुआ था। उसमें जो प्रस्ताव पारित हुआ था, उसमें कहा गया, *"अतः कार्य-समिति इसे नितांत आवश्यक समझती है कि अपना परमाणु बम बनाने के सभी प्रयत्न किए जाने चाहिए। वह भारत सरकार से अनुरोध करती है कि अपनी नीति में आवश्यकता के अनुरूप परिवर्तन करे"*।

आज 4 दिसम्बर, 2007 को हम उसके ऊपर चर्चा करने के लिए यहां पर इकट्ठा हुए हैं। परमाणु हथियारों के बारे में हमारी क्या चिंता है, इसके बारे में मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा, हमारी चिंता यह है कि अगर हमारे ऊपर प्रतिबंध लगता है कि हम आगे टेस्ट नहीं कर सकते है, कोई परमाणु परीक्षण नहीं कर सकते हैं, तो हमारे हथियार की जो गुणवत्ता है, उसका क्या होगा? मैं यह प्रश्न सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ। मैं जानता हूँ कि जब भी यह प्रश्न पूछा गया है, तब हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उठ कर बार-बार सदन को और देश को यह आश्वासन दिया है कि नहीं, टेस्टिंग के ऊपर 123 समझौते में कोई रोक नहीं है और हम टेस्टिंग करने के लिए स्वतंत्र हैं। 123 में नहीं है। अभी हमारे मित्र श्री सीताराम येचुरी जी कह रहे थे ...**(व्यवधान)**... उन्होंने कहा कि "123 is rooted in the Hyde Act" हाइड एक्ट के क्या प्रावधान हैं, उनके बारे में हम सब जानते हैं। प्रधान मंत्री जी कहते हैं कि हम टेस्ट करने के लिए स्वतंत्र हैं। उपसभापति महोदय, हम स्वतंत्र हैं, कुतुब मीनार से नीचे कूदने के लिए भी। सिर्फ हमें उसके कंसिक्वेंसेज़ को, उसके परिणाम को भुगतना होगा। हम जानते हैं कि अगर हम कुतुब मीनार से कूदे, तो उसका क्या परिणाम होगा? उसी प्रकार अमेरिका के द्वारा यह बिल्कुल स्पष्ट कर दिया गया है कि अगर हमने आगे कोई टेस्ट किया, तो उसके क्या परिणाम होंगे। इसलिए हमें चिंता है, क्योंकि टेक्नोलॉजी स्थिर नहीं रहती है। टेक्नोलॉजी की गति कभी रुकती नहीं है। जैसे दूसरे देश अपने परमाणु हथियार को, उसकी टेक्नोलॉजी को, आगे बढ़ाने का लगातार प्रयास कर रहे हैं, वैसा भारत को भी करना पड़ेगा। क्यों करना पड़ेगा, क्योंकि हमारा जो न्यूक्लियर डॉक्ट्रिन है, जिसको इस सरकार ने भी स्वीकार किया है, उस न्यूक्लियर डॉक्ट्रिन का मुख्य मुद्दा है, जो उसी से फ्लो करता है, उससे निकलता है, वह है- "credible minimum deterrent". अब हम उस सरकार का क्या करें, जो "credible minimum deterrent" और "minimum credible deterrent" में क्या अंतर है, इस बात को समझती ही नही है? 07 मार्च, 2006 को प्रधान मत्री जी का यही बयान हुआ था, *suo moto* statement, जिसमे उन्होंने जिन शब्दो का प्रयोग किया है, वह है- "minimum credible deterrent". यहाँ पर बोलते हुए हमारे मित्र आनंद शर्मा जी, जो राज्य मंत्री हैं, पिछले साल जब अगस्त के महीने में डिबेट हो रही थी, तब इस मुद्दे पर उन्होंने भी "minimum credible deterrent" की बात की थी। हम लोगों ने उन्हे टोका, कहा कि यह "credible minimum deterrent" है, not "minimum credible deterrent". लेकिन, अगर हमारा एप्रोच minimalist है, credibility is not the important thing, important thing is 'minimum', तो हमारे एप्रोच मे फर्क होगा और आपके एप्रोच में फर्क होगा। उपसभापति महोदय, मैं यह कह रहा था कि इस बात को लेकर हमें चिंता है और ...**(व्यवधान)**...

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): Sir, he has taken my name. Last year, on 17th of August...*(Interruptions)*. I am not intervening in the debate. Since Shri Yashwant Sinha has named me, I am very much within my right to respond. We have not said so. He is trying to give an impression that this Government has diluted; this Government has compromised when it comes to the 'deterrent'. That is not the truth. In that debate, in fact, what their Government had done was fully exposed, including the commitment that they had made to sign the CTBT, which the then Prime Minister, Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee...*(Interruptions)*.

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा : नहीं, वे भाषण दे रहे हैं, तो दे ...**(व्यवधान)**... मुझे कोई एतराज़ नहीं है ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: So, do not put words in my mouth. We have not said so.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, Mr. Anand Sharma is not defending. He is levelling...*(Interruptions)*...against us.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: No, I am not. You have named us.

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा : उपसभापति महोदय, इसलिए हमें अपने परमाणु हथियार कार्यक्रमों को लेकर चिंता है। हमें चिंता है, जैसा अभी सीताराम येचुरी जी हमें बता रहे थे, कि अमेरिकी प्रशासन की जो नीयत है, उसके अनुसार अगर हम इसमें, इस बिल में फँसते हैं, तो अनेक प्रतिबंधों के साथ-साथ यह प्रतिबंध भी हमारे ऊपर लगेगा कि हम आगे टेस्ट नहीं कर सकते हैं। अब यहाँ पर नया तर्क क्या दिया जा रहा है? यहाँ पर हमारे मित्र कपिल सिब्बल जी बैठे हुए हैं। मैंने देखा है अखबारों में, टी0वी0 चैनल्स में और सरकार के दूसरे मंत्रियों का तर्क क्या है कि हाइड एक्ट से हमें क्या लेना-देना है। "हाइड एक्ट" हमारे ऊपर लागू नहीं होता, हम को तो सिर्फ 123 समझौते से मतलब है। उपसभापति महोदय, मैं आप का ध्यान आकृष्ट करना चाहता हूं, जो इसी सदन में 17 अगस्त, 2006 को बोलते हुए हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा था। उन्होंने कहा था, and, I am quoting, he said, "we have concerns over both the House and the Senate versions of the Bill." जब हम ने इस के बारे में चिंता प्रकट की थी कि अमेरिकी सीनेट के सामने जो प्रारूप है, उस में इस प्रकार के प्रावधान हैं जो हमें मान्य नहीं होने चाहिए। तो प्रधान मंत्री जी ने हम से सहमत होते हुए कहा कि "we have concerns over both the House and the Senate versions of the Bill" और उसके बाद उन्होंने आगे कहा कि "The draft Senate Bill requires the US President to make an annual report to the Congress that includes certification that India is in full compliance of its non-proliferation and other commitments. We have made it clear to the US our opposition to these provisions even if they are projected as non-binding, even if they are projected as non-binding, on India as being contrary to the letter and spirit of the July statement. We have told the US administration that the effect of such certification will be to diminish a permanent waiver authority into an annual one. We have also indicated that this would introduce an element of uncertainty regarding future cooperation and is, therefore, not acceptable to us." This is what the Prime Minister said.

महोदय, मैं आज के दिन निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि, भूल जाइए एनुअल सर्टिफिकेशन को, भूल जाइए कि एक साल में एक बार US Congress और कांग्रेसनल कमेटीज को रिपोर्ट करना पड़ता है। "हाइड एक्ट" में तो यह लिखा है कि, "the two Committees will be kept fully and currently informed which creates an obligation upon the executive branch to inform the appropriate Committees whenever significant information becomes available rather than waiting to include it in a regularly scheduled report". हर दफा जब कभी कोई बात होती है तो यू0एस0 कांग्रेस को सूचना दो। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा, and, I quote, "We oppose any legislative provisions that mandate the scrutiny of either our nuclear weapons programme or our unsafeguarded nuclear facilities. Again I quote from the Prime Minister's speech, "If in their final form, the US legislation or the adapted NSG guideline impose extraneous condition on India, you have my assurance that the Government will draw the necessary conclusions, consistent with the commitments that I have made to Parliament."

फिर उन्होंने कहा, and, I quote, "we cannot accept restrictions on India's foreign policy to be imposed such as on Iran irrespective of whether it is in the policy section or in the sense of the house section of the legislation. यह प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यहां इसी सदन में 17 अगस्त को पिछले साल कहा। Again I am quoting, "Any prescriptive suggestions in this regard are not acceptable to us."

फिर मैं कोट करता हूं, "If the US Congress, in its wisdom, passes the Bill in its present form, the product would become unacceptable to India". Again मैं कोट कर रहा हूं, "it is clear that if the final product is in its current form, India will have grave difficulties in accepting the

Bills". यह प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा और उपसभापति महोदय, सारा सदन इस बात को जानता है कि दोनों कमेटीज के सामने - हाउस इंटरनेशनल रिलेशंस कमेटी और सीनेट फॉरेन रिलेशंस कमेटी, दोनों सदनों के सामने जो ड्राफ्ट बिल्स थे, जो फाइनल "हाइड एक्ट" बना, उस से कहीं ज्यादा बदतर बना। उन दोनों के जो worst provisions भारत के लिए थे, उन दोनों का समावेश "हाइड एक्ट" में किया गया। "हाइड" साहब गुजर गए, भगवान उनकी आत्मा को शांति दे, लेकिन उन्होंने जो काम किया, वह यह कि दोनों के worst provisions को combine कर लिया। और उसके बाद यह हाइड एक्ट बना। उपसभापति महोदय, मेरे पास यह कागज़ है, Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference. दोनों सदनों की जो कमिटी थी, उसकी कांफ्रेंस में क्या हुआ और उसके बाद उन्होंने सारे हाइड एक्ट के एक-एक क्लाज़ की व्याख्या की और सारा कुछ लिखा। मैं आपसे और आपके माध्यम से सदन से कह रहा हूं the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference has this to say. "The Administration's proposed legislation would have given the President the authority to permanently waive these provisions for India, subject to the President's determination that India had achieved certain benchmarks". "In effect, the Administration's proposal would have given it excessive latitude in negotiating a Nuclear Cooperation Agreement with India, leaving Congress with little ability to influence the terms of that Agreement regardless of any concerns it might have. Both, the House International Relations Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee rejected this approach.

उसके बाद वे क्या कह रहे हैं? Atomic Energy Act, 1954 का एक सैक्शन 129 है। उन्होंने कहा,

"The Administration's Bill would have made section 129 inapplicable to such future actions on the part of India like testing, like violating IAEA safeguards, etc. The Congress has ensured that section 129 leading to termination of Cooperation would continue to apply". And, I am quoting it further. "As further clarified in the section-by-section analysis included in this Report, the Conference believe that there should be no ambiguity regarding the legal and policy consequences of any future Indian test of a nuclear explosive devise. In that event, the President must terminate all export and re-export of US origin nuclear material, nuclear equipment and sensitive nuclear technology to India. The Conferences expect the President to make full and immediate use of US rights to demand return of all nuclear-related items". And, this is incorporated in Article 14 (2) of the 123 Agreement which says "The party seeking termination" — and this is very important, Sir — "The party seeking termination has the right to cease further cooperation under this Agreement if it determines that a mutually acceptable resolution on outstanding issues has not been possible or cannot be achieved through consultations". और इसीलिए हमारे मित्र श्री सीताराम येचुरी जी जो कह रहे थे कि जब अमरीकी पदाधिकारी यह कहते हैं कि हमने हाइड एक्ट के सारे प्रावधानों का पालन किया है, तो वे बिल्कुल सही कहते हैं। उन्होंने हाइड एक्ट के एक भी प्रावधान का कोई उल्लंघन 123 एग्रीमेंट में नहीं किया। इसमें भी कई बातें कही जाती हैं। इसलिए Joint Explanatory Statement से मुझे यह क्वोट करना पड़ रहा है and I am quoting, "The US must ensure that any decision that the NSG makes regarding granting an exemption for nuclear commerce does not disadvantage US industry by setting less strict conditions for countries trading with India than those embodied in the conditions and requirements of this Act. अब यहां बैठे हुए उस तरफ के हमारे बहुत सारे मित्र कहते हैं कि बहुत अच्छी बात है, हम तो अमरीका के साथ यह समझौता करेंगे, फिर अमरीका को दरकिनार कर देंगे, उनसे हम कोई सामान नहीं खरीदेंगे और सारा सामान हम फ्रांस से, रूस से और दूसरे मुल्कों से खरीदेंगे, अमरीका ताकता रह जाएगा और हमारी चांदी होगी। इससे बढ़कर मुझे लगता है कि मूर्खता की, I am sorry, I am using that word, कोई बात नहीं हो सकती है। Joint Explanatory Memorandum में NSG के सामने यह सरकार क्या जाएगी, जाएगी तो अमरीकी सरकार, क्योंकि हमारी कोई हैसियत NSG में नहीं है। अमरीका ने प्रॉमिस किया है कि वह हमारे केस को NSG में लेकर जाएगा और वहां से आप समझते

3.00 P.M.

हैं कि कांग्रेस का यह जो डायरेक्शन है, उसे नज़रअंदाज करके वे हमें NSG में better चांस देंगे than what we have got in the Hyde Act. This is incorporated in Article 12(2)(a) of the Hyde Act जो कहता है and I quote, "No country party to this shall secure unfair commercial or industrial advantages or restrict trade to the disadvantage of persons and undertakings of either Party or hamper their commercial or industrial interests, whether international or domestic, fully protected in the 123 Agreement" जो उनकी कांग्रेस ने कहा है।

फिर वह कह रहे हैं and again I am quoting, "Equally important is the need to ensure that the U.S. cooperation does not assist the Indian nuclear weapons programme directly or indirectly." Again I am quoting, "Indian officials have publicly stated that under the US-India Agreement, India will be able to produce as much fissile material for weapons purposes as it desires. At the same time, however, many experts have said that there is no reason why India would need or want to increase that production significantly. The conferees hope that India will demonstrate restraint and not increase significantly its production of fissile material." And this is very important and I would like the House to take note of this. I am quoting from the Joint Memorandum, "If civil nuclear commerce were to be seen, some years from now as having in fact contributed to India's nuclear weapons programme, there could be severe consequences for nuclear cooperation, for U.S.-Indian relations, and for the world-wide nuclear non-proliferation regime." "Severe consequences," अमरीकी संसद हमें warn कर रही है, there will be "severe consequences" for US-Indian relations. इसे नज़रअंदाज़ कर दें, हम भूल जाएं इसको?

उपसभापति महोदय, सुषमा जी ने आज से ढाई साल पहले जो बात कही थी कि जब से हम अमरीका के साथ इस Nuclear Deal की बात कर रहे हैं, उनकी तरफ से जितने वक्तव्य आए हैं, वे एक दिशा दिखाते हैं, लेकिन हमारी तरफ से जो थोड़े से वक्तव्य आए हैं, वे दूसरी दिशा दिखाते हैं। उनका purpose यह है कि किसी भी तरह भारत को Non- Proliferation Network Regime में ले आओ। हम बार-बार energy की बात करते हैं कि हम energy के लिए यह सब कर रहे हैं और बाकी सारी चीजें हमने नज़रअंदाज़ कर दीं।

अब यह 123 समझौता है। तीन बातें हैं, जो सीताराम येचुरी जी ने भी कहीं कि सरकार यह कह रही है कि हमको तीन बड़े फायदे होने वाले हैं — उसमें एक यह है कि Nuclear Isolation and nuclear apartheid खत्म हो जाएगा। पता नहीं इस Nuclear Isolation को लेकर आज 2007 में हमें क्यों इतनी चिंता हो गई है? मेरी जितने भी लोगों से बात हुई है, जो साइंटिस्ट्स इस फील्ड में काम करते हैं, उन्होंने कहा कि भारत के ऊपर 1974 से, जब श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने पोखरण-1 टेस्ट किए, उसके बाद से जितने प्रतिबंध लगे, आज इतने साल हो गए हैं, 33 years have gone by, in these 33 years Indian nuclear technology has only progressed. आगे बढ़ी है, क्या कोई यहां उठकर कह सकता है कि हम पिछड़ गए हैं? प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा कि कोई न्यूक्लियर रेनेसांस बस है, जो हम miss कर जाएंगे। सारी दुनिया आज इंडियन बस में चढ़ने की कोशिश कर रही है और हमें चिंता है कि पता नहीं हम कौन सी बस miss कर रहे हैं? जितने साइंटिस्ट्स से हमारी बात हुई है, उन्होंने कहा है कि this nuclear isolation has proved to be a boon for India, not a bane for India. इसी के चलते जब प्रधान मंत्री जी ने 18 जुलाई, 2005 को वाशिंगटन में जो ज्वाइंट स्टेटमेंट issue किया था, उसमें यह कहा गया था कि, 'India is a responsible State with advanced nuclear technology.' हम advanced nuclear technology वाले देश कैसे बन गए, जो हम अमरीका के समकक्ष खड़े हो गए हैं? हम अपने साइंटिस्ट्स की मेहनत के चलते, अपनी technology की मेहनत के चलते, अमरीका के समकक्ष खड़े हो गए हैं। कैसे हमारे ऊपर Nuclear Isolation का असर पड़ा, इसलिए हम Nuclear Isolation, Nuclear Apathy का रोना, रोना बंद कर दें। उससे कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता है। हमने जो कहा, तीन चीजें बहुत फायदे की होंगी, क्या-क्या तीन चीजें

बहुत फायदे की होंगी। एक होगा - टेक्नोलॉजी ट्रांसफर, हमें एडवांस टेक्नोलॉजी प्राप्त होगा। अब इसमें जो 123 एग्रीमेंट है, इसमें article 5(2) क्या कहता है, मैं पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ, Sensitive nuclear technology, heavy water production technology, sensitive nuclear facilities, heavy water production facilities and major critical components of such facilities may be transferred under this Agreement, pursuant to an amendment to this Agreement. यह एग्रीमेंट अभी पैदा नहीं हुआ, अभी इस पर हस्ताक्षर नहीं हुआ, and already it is talking of amendment of this. (जब यह अमेण्डमेंट पूरा होगा, पहले यह डील होगी, उसके बाद 123 समझौता होगा, उसके बाद इसका एक अमेण्डमेंट होगा, तब उसके बाद यह सेंसिटिव न्यूक्लीयर टेक्नोलॉजी हमें प्राप्त होगी ---(व्यवधान½--- : उसके बाद फ्यूल सप्लाई की बात आती है, सबसे बड़ी बात जो है, वह यह है कि बार-बार सरकार की तरफ से मिथ्या प्रचार किया जा रहा है कि हमें fuel supply for the life time of the nuclear reactor मिल जाएगा। न्यूक्लीयर रिएक्टर का लाइफ टाइम तीस साल है, चालीस साल है, तीस-चालीस सालों का जो हमें फ्यूल चाहिए, वह एक ही साथ हमें प्राप्त हो जाएगा। अब उसके कॉस्ट की बात मैं नहीं करना चाहता हूँ, हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी वित्त मंत्री भी रहे हैं, प्रणब बाबू, External Affairs Minister, यहां बैठे हैं, यह भी वित्त मंत्री रहे हैं, लेकिन इनको कॉस्ट की चिंता नहीं है। अगर कोई थर्मल पावर स्टेशन खोलना चाहे तो कहेगा कि हम तीस-चालीस साल के लिए पूरे कोयले की सप्लाई लेकर बैठ जाएंगे, उसका एक कॉस्ट है या नहीं, उस कॉस्ट का क्या होगा, कोई बता नहीं रहा है, लेकिन मैं यहां पर आपको बतानां चाहता हूँ कि यह assurance कहां पर है, यह assurance article (6) में है, article (6) क्या कह रहा है, The United States has conveyed its commitment to the reliable supply of fuel to India etc. उपसभापति महोदय, इस्में कृपया ध्यान दें, यह जो है, this whole Article 6 has been lifted.

THE MINISTER OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND THE MINISTER OF EARTH SCIENCES (SHRI KAPIL SIBAL): It is Article 5, sub-clause 6, and not Article 6.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Okay. Article 5, sub-clause 6, a, b, 1,2,3, 4, of Article 5, –;g lkjk dk lkjk article 5 का जो है, It has been bodily lifted in the same language in which the Prime Minister had included it in his statement last March. ठीक है, अब आप देखिए कि इसमें कितना हास्यास्पद है, It is so ridiculous. यह क्या कह रहा है? अगर मार्च, 2006 में उस समय अगर कोई भविष्य की बात करता है, क्या भविष्य की बात : As part of its implementation of July 18, 2005 joint statement, the United States is committed to seeking agreement from the US Congress to amend its domestic laws and to work with friends and allies to work in the energy. यह ठीक था, मार्च, 2006 में ये वायदा कर रहे हैं कि भाई हम ऐसा करेंगे। अब यह जो 123 एग्रीमेंट है, यह हो गया और आज ही निकलस बर्न्स का स्टेटमेंट आया है, उसके पहले प्रधान मंत्री का स्टेटमेंट आया, This is casting stone. यह बदला नहीं जा सकता है, इसका मतलब है कि कोई शब्द नहीं बदला जाएगा। यह अमेरिकी कांग्रेस के पास एप्रूवल के लिए जाएगी, अमेरिकी कांग्रेस एप्रूवल करते समय क्या कहेगी? उपसभापति महोदय, वह एप्रूव करेगी, the US is willing to incorporate assurances regarding fuel supply in the bilateral US-Indo agreement on peaceful uses of nuclear energy under section 123 of the US Atomic Energy Act, which would be submitted to the US Congress. I hope you have imbibed it. यूएस कांग्रेस यह पास करेगी कि 123 समझौता जब भारत के साथ होगा, उसमें न्यूक्लीयर फ्यूल सप्लाई का assurance हम incorporated करेंगे, जब अमेरिकी कांग्रेस के सामने एप्रूवल के लिए आएगी। अरे भाई, हमारे मित्र शत्रुघ्न सिन्हा अभी यहां नहीं है, अगर वह होते तो कहते कि दद्दू, यही न 123 एग्रीमेंट है, इसमें नहीं किया तो किसमें करोगे।

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: You read the first two lines. ..(*Interruption*)..

श्री यशवंत flUgk: आनंद शर्मा जी, हमने सब लाइन पढ़ लिया है ---(व्यवधान)---

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: You are misleading.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: No. I am not misleading. The first two lines is, "To further

guard against any disruption of fuel supplies, the US is prepared to take the following additional steps". What are the following additional steps? "That we will go to the US Congress after the 123 Agreement is signed. We will incorporate it". Where is that assurance in this 123 Agreement? मैं चैलेंज करके पूछना चाहता हूं कि where is that assurance of fuel supply for the life-time of the reactors? यह कोई मुझे यहां पर बता दे। उपसभापति महोदय, इन्होंने क्या वायदा किया कि बहुत बढ़िया हो जाएगा — वह होगा कि हमें राइट टू रीप्रोसेस मिल गया। टेक्नोलॉजी टू रीप्रोसेस नहीं, that is incorporated in article 14. राइट टू रीप्रोसेस में क्या कहता है? कहता है कि आप कैम्पेन मोड में नहीं करोगे। जो हमारी existing facilities हैं, उसमें हम रीप्रोसेस नहीं करेंगे। हमें रीप्रोसेस की टेक्नोलॉजी भी नहीं मिलेगी। छोड़िए, रीप्रोसेस की टेक्नोलॉजी हमारे पास है। लेकिन उसमें क्या होगा? We will be required to set up a dedicated facility to reprocess the imported spent fuel. और उसका जो अरेंजमेंट्स ऐंड प्रोसीजर्स होगा, उसके बारे में we will have a separate agreement with the US. फिर से ऐग्रीमेंट होगा। जब ऐग्रीमेंट होगा तो वह कांग्रेस के पास जाएगा। कांग्रेस के पास जाएगा तो उस समय कौन राष्ट्रपति होगा? बुश साहब शाश्वत तो हैं नहीं, उनका टर्म तो खत्म होने जा रहा है। फिर कौन होगा, मित्र होगा या मित्र नहीं होगा, क्या करेगा?

श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी (उत्तर प्रदेश): ये खुद कह रहे हैं कि डेमोक्रेट होगा और फिट नहीं हो पाएगा... **(व्यवधान)**... ये स्वयं कह रहे हैं। डेमोक्रेट होगा और बड़ा मुश्किल हो जाएगा।

श्री شاہد صدیقی : یہ خود کہہ رہے ہیں کہ ڈیموکریٹ ہوگا اور فٹ نہیں ہو پائے گا۔مداخلت۔۔ یہ خود کہہ رہے ہیں۔ ڈیموکریٹ ہوگا اور بڑا مشکل ہو جائے گا۔

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा: मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि चाहे वह सेंसेटिव टेक्नोलॉजी हो, चाहे वह फ्यूल सप्लाई हो, चाहे वह रीप्रोसेसिंग का राइट हो, जिसके बारे में सारी दुनिया में ढिंढोरा पीटा जा रहा है, लोगों को बरगलाने की कोशिश हो रही है कि सब कुछ हमें मिल गया है। कुछ नहीं मिला है। सब कुछ मिथ्या है। मैं इस बात को ज़ोर देकर कह रहा हूं कि यह सारा असत्य है। To supplement what I am saying, I would again like to quote from the Joint Explanatory Memorandum. वह क्या कह रहा है?

> "The US will support an Indian effort to develop a strategic reserve of nuclear fuel to guard against any disruption of supply over the life of India's reactors".

यह मार्च 2006 का है। I am quoting:

> "The Congress has not been able to determine precisely what was said on this matter in high level US-India discussions. The US officials testified, however, that the United States does not intend to help India to build a stockpile of nuclear fuel for the purpose of riding out any sanctions that might be imposed in response to Indian actions such as conducting another nuclear test. The conferees understand that nuclear reactor facilities commonly have some fresh fuel stored, so as to minimise bound time when reactor cores are removed. They endorse the Senate proposal, however, that there will be a clear use policy that any fuel reserve provided to India should be commensurate with normal operating requirements for India's safeguarded reactors."

Again, I am quoting:

> "The conferees understand and expect that such assurance of supply arrangements that the US is party to will be concerned with only disruption of supply of fuel due to market failures or similar reasons and not due to Indian actions that are inconsistent with the July 18, 2005 commitment such as nuclear explosive testing."

श्री उपसभापति : सिन्हा साहब, आपको अरुण शौरी जी के लिए भी कुछ समय छोड़ना पड़ेगा।

*Translation is Urdu Script.

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा : सर, मैं खत्म कर रहा हूं। मैं चाहता हूं कि अरुण जी को पूरा टाइम मिले क्योंकि अगर अरुण जी इस न्युक्लीयर डील के बारे में, if he does not know anything, then it is not worth knowing. That is why I want him to give time. यह तो इसकी बात हो गयी। लेकिन अब विदेश नीति की बात है। अभी हमारे मित्र सीताराम येचुरी जी बता रहे थे कि ईरान का क्या हुआ? LNG डील खत्म हो गयी, पाइप लाइन डील खत्म हो गयी, कैसे स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के ऊपर हो गया, कैसे एस्सार कम्पनी, जो भारत की कम्पनी है, उसने अपना प्रस्ताव वापस ले लिया। यह सब कुछ है। कैसे शंघाई कोआपरेशन एग्रीमेंट में शामिल होने के लिए हम लोगों ने जी तोड़ परिश्रम किया था। उसमें हम शामिल हो गए। हमको ऑब्जर्वर स्टेटस मिल गया। जहां तक मुझे याद है, उसकी दो बार सम्मिट मीटिंग हो गई। दूसरे प्राइम मिनिस्टर्स, प्रेजीडेंट्स को यह फुर्सत थी कि वह शंघाई कोआपरेशन एग्रीमेंट में शामिल हों। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री को दो बार भी मौका नहीं मिला इसमें शामिल होने का। क्यों, क्योंकि शंघाई कोआपरेशन एग्रीमेंट अमेरिका को पसंद नहीं है। इसलिए अमेरिका नाखुश नहीं हो जाए इसलिए शंघाई कोआपरेशन एग्रीमेंट में हम नहीं जाएंगे।

THE PRIME MINISTER (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I respectfully submit that the hon. Member is levelling false charges. There was never any pressure on us or on me to join or not going to Shanghai meeting. All that I was interested was that if the Indian Prime Minister goes to these meetings, he should not sit in the side lounge, coffee lounge and not be involved in an active manner.

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा : बहुत बढ़िया, खूब तालियां बजी।...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Your Prime Minister would have done that.

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ (Madhya Pradesh): The Prime Minister is of the country. The Prime Minister is not yours or ours.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Yes, of course. Our Prime Minister never sat on any international high table. यह तो आप ही की तकदीर में है और खूब ताली बजाई आपने। प्रधान मंत्री जी क्यों नहीं गए, क्योंकि वे कॉफी शॉप पर नहीं बैठना चाहते थे, वे चाहते थे कि मेन टेबल पर बैठें। तो इंतजार करेंगे जब आपके परिश्रम के चलते, आपके एफर्ट्स के चलते जब हाई टेबल आएगा तब आप शंघाई कोआपरेशन एग्रीमेंट में जाएंगे। यह बात सारा सदन नोट करे, तब तक हमारे प्रधान मंत्री शंघाई कोआपरेशन एग्रीमेंट की सम्मिट मीटिंग में नहीं जाएंगे, इसका यही मतलब है। लेकिन वह छोड़ दीजिए कि इरान के साथ क्या हो रहा है, रूस के साथ क्या हो रहा है। क्यों नहीं Kudamkulam के चार रिएक्टर का समझौता हुआ। मेरे पास यहां पर कुछ कागज हैं, जिसमें बिल्कुल यह साफ स्पष्ट है कि रूस के साथ यह समझौता दस्तखत होने के लिए तैयार था। जाने के एक-दो दिन पहले यह घोषणा हो गई कि प्रधान मंत्री Kudamkulam के चार रिएक्टर के समझौते के ऊपर हस्ताक्षर करेंगे। मुझे बहुत चिंता है, मैंने भी कुछ दिन उस मंत्रालय में कार्य किया है इसलिए मुझे cgqr चिंता इस बात की है कि आखिर भारत और रूस के संबंधों का हो क्या रहा है। हम कहां हैं। हमारे विदेश मंत्री मास्को जाते हैं। वहां रूस के राष्ट्रपति की तो बात छोड़ दीजिए लेकिन उनकी रूस के विदेश मंत्री से भी मुलाकात नहीं होती है। हमारे डिफेंस मिनिस्टर रूस जाते हैं। उनकी रूस के प्रेजीडेंट से मुलाकात नहीं होती है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जाते हैं जैसा आज लीडर ऑफ दि अपोजिशन कह रहे थे, 28 घंटों के लिए मास्को जाते हैं और Kudamkulam के चार रिएक्टर के समझौते पर हस्ताक्षर नहीं होते हैं। क्यों नहीं होता है? क्या प्रधान मंत्री जी, क्या विदेश मंत्री जी स्पष्ट करेंगे इस सदन में कि ऐसी क्या बाध्यता आ गई, कौन सी मजबूरी थी जिसके चलते रूस के साथ हमने इस समझौते को आगे नहीं बढ़ाया।

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: I am willing to do that right away and that will show, I think, what falsehood you are preaching in this House. It is true that there was a draft of an agreement for four additional reactors. But it has always been understood that that agreement can be operationalised only if India had the approval of the IAEA for an India specific safeguards agreement and also if India had the exemption granted to it by the NSG. Since these issues are now being debated and for the reasons which I do not have to go into, it was

quite obvious that that agreement would not be operationalised in the absence of these two requirements which are now under discussion in various fora. Contrary to the impression that you are trying to create, I think, the Russians fully understand it and all this false propaganda that is being made here and outside is not related to the facts of the case.

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा : उपसभापति महोदय, मुझे खुशी है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने चाहे जिन भी शब्दों में हो, इस बात की सफाई दी है। जो बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती, वह यह है कि जब रशिन आफिशियल्स उनकी विजिट से पहले भारत आए, जब भारत के विदेश मंत्री उनकी विजिट से पहले रूस गए, जब भारत के रक्षा मंत्री उनकी विजिट से पहले रूस गए और यह सारा कुछ तय हो गया, कागज हस्ताक्षर के लिए तैयार हो गए, तब ...**(व्यवधान)**... और जैसे हमने Kudamkulam के पहले दो रिएक्टर्स के बाद किया है कि हमारा IAEA का सेफगार्ड, रिएक्टर स्पेसिफिक सेफगार्ड होगा, मान लीजिए यह भी नहीं होता है, मान लीजिए कि यह NSG था, मान लीजिए कि यह IAEA था, एग्रिमेंट के तहत जब ये दोनों कार्यवाही पूरी हो जाती, तब उसके बाद हस्ताक्षर करने या ऑप्रेशनलाइज करने का सवाल आता, तो महोदय क्या प्रधान मंत्री जी इतना नहीं कर सकते थे कि वे हस्ताक्षर करते, subject to the NSG approving this... **(व्यवधान)**... क्यों नहीं करते? मैं फिर पूरी गंभीरता के साथ ...**(व्यवधान)**

श्री उपसभापति : मिस्टर यशवंत सिन्हा जी, देखिए आपका टाइम ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा : मैं पूरी गंभीरता के साथ इस सरकार के ऊपर आरोप लगाता हूं कि आपने अमेरिकी दबाव में आकर उस पर हस्ताक्षर नहीं किए। ...**(व्यवधान)**... यह साफ बात है, आप अमेरिका के दबाव में आए। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, Shri Sinha is levying false charges against our Government. Perhaps he is reminded of his own performance, when as India's Finance Minister, he went to Japan and he was not allowed to meet the Finance Minister there. He thinks all people are like him.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: I am sorry, the Prime Minister has got personal...*(Interruptions)* Do you expect the Prime Minister to get so personal?*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: When you say that, you have to be prepared to take it also...*(Interruptions)* Why are you all getting up?*(Interruptions)* Yashwant Sinhaji, there is another speaker from your party and you have already taken 50 minutes. It is more than the allotted time...*(Interruptions)* Please conclude...*(Interruptions)* प्लीज, आप बैठिए, आप बैठिए। शाहिद साहब, शाहिद साहब...**(व्यवधान)**... Why are ... आप बैठिए। ...**(व्यवधान)**... मिस्टर यशवंत सिन्हा जी, अरुण शौरी जी हैं,...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा: उपसभापति महोदय, मैं व्यक्तिगत नहीं होना चाहता हूं, लेकिन मैं यह पूरे विश्वास के साथ कह रहा हूं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी का अभी सदन में जो वक्तव्य हुआ है, वह सरासर गलत है। ...**(व्यवधान)** यह गलत है। ...**(व्यवधान)**... प्रधान मंत्री उस समय जिस प्रधान मंत्री के नीचे थे, मैं वित्त मंत्री था, ये उनके आर्थिक सलाहकार थे। ...**(व्यवधान)**... उससे क्या होता है, उससे यह होता है कि ...**(व्यवधान)**...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. When your leaders are speaking, you kindly sit down...*(Interruptions)*

रेल मंत्री (श्री लालू प्रसाद): यशवंत सिन्हा जी के मुंह से यह शोभा नहीं देता है, हमारे नेता कर्पुरी ठाकुर जी मुख्यमंत्री थे, ये उनके PA थे। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is this happening?*(Interruptions)* देखिए,..**(व्यवधान)**.. यह क्या हो रहा है? ...**(व्यवधान)**... यह क्या हो रहा है? ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री उपसभापति : आप डिबेट को इस लेवल पर मत ले जाइए ...**(व्यवधान)**... Sinhaji, please conclude.

Otherwise, Mr. Arun Shourie will not get the time. I am making it clear that Mr. Arun Shourie will not get the time.

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा : उपसभापति महोदय, लालू जी बिल्कुल सही कह रहे हैं। मैं इसका विरोध कहाँ कर रहा हूँ। वे बिल्कुल सही कह रहे हैं। जब कर्पूरी जी ...**(व्यवधान)**... जब कर्पूरी जी बिहार के मुख्य मंत्री थे, तो मैं उनका प्रधान सचिव था। यह बात सही है और लालू जी मेरे कमरे में सिफारिश करने आते थे ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री लालू प्रसाद : आएंगे ...**(व्यवधान)**...

प्रो. राम देव भंडारी (बिहार): आपका लिंक कर्पूरी ठाकुर से जुड़ा था ...**(व्यवधान)**... वे आपके कमरे में नहीं आते थे ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा : और उपसभापति महोदय, एक दिन ये मेरे कमरे में किसी की सिफारिश करने आए। उन्होंने कहा कि यह मेरे साथ जेल में था। मैंने कहा कि शायद जय प्रकाश आन्दोलन में जेल गया हो। जब कागज-पत्र निकाला, तो पता चला कि मीसा में जेल में था, किसी जुर्म में जेल में था ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री उपसभापति : आप क्या कर रहे हैं ...**(व्यवधान)**... सिन्हा जी, आप प्लीज़ कंक्लूड कीजिए। There are 34 Members to speak. I have to regulate the time. Please cooperate.

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा : सर, मैं अन्तिम बात यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री उपसभापति : आप कंक्लूड कीजिए।

श्री यशवंत सिन्हा : उपसभापति महोदय, जब मैं इसके बारे में कागज देख रहा था, तो मैंने देखा कि जब प्रधान मंत्री जी 2005 में वाशिंगटन गए थे, जब इन्होंने 18 जुलाई को हस्ताक्षर किया, 20 जुलाई को मीडिया के सामने उपस्थित हुए, उनका जो प्रेस कंफेरेंस हुआ, मेरे पास उसका transcript है, प्रेस कंफेरेंस में इनसे एक सवाल पूछा गया कि "Mr. Prime Minister, do you see any resistance coming forward from your allies and the Opposition in putting the new India-US policy to practice and will you seek a parliamentary consensus or approval to the new direction you seem to be taking in foreign policy?" यह सवाल था। इसका उत्तर यह था and I am quoting, "Well, the Parliament in our country is sovereign. It is my intention to make a statement in Parliament when I go back home, and it goes without saying that we can move forward only on the basis of a broad national consensus". अब यह दूसरी बात है कि उन्होंने उसमें और भी यह जोड़ दिया कि "I am confident that what we have done and what we have achieved will command universal support of the thinking segment of our country". अब यहाँ पर हमारे जैसे लोग, सीताराम येचुरी जी जैसे लोग, दिग्विजय सिंह जी जैसे लोग, हमारे अमर सिंह जी हैं और हमारे अनेक और साथी, जो यहाँ पर हैं, जो इस हाउस की majority हैं, ये सारे लोग thinking segment of population को नहीं belong करते हैं। हम सब लोग unthinking लोग हैं और इसलिए हम इसका विरोध कर रहे हैं। मैं अपने दल की तरफ से इस बिल का पुरजोर विरोध करता हूँ और यहाँ पर यह घोषणा करता हूँ कि अगर हम सत्ता में आए, जो आएंगे, तो हम इस डील को re-negotiate करेंगे, हम इस डील को आगे नहीं जाने देंगे। मैं आपसे यही कहना चाहता हूँ।

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise on a debate which, Sir, is an unusual amalgam of politics, of economics, of technical jargons, of statistical analyses and, indeed, of law. It is a debate, Sir, which has been oozing out of our respective ears for so many months, and perhaps, this delayed debate would have dampened some interest in it. But the issues are no less important. The issues retain their vital importance. And we hope that especially since it is a parliamentary debate, there will be far less of explosion or implosion and far more of fusion and fission, or, at least, far more of light than heat. Sir, this is a matter where we should keep out of our mind some premeditated notions and approach the subject with a critical enquiring eye and an open mind and then allow the power of reason and logic to operate.

Sir, may I say at the outset that this is a good deal for a good and responsible nation by a good Government headed by a good Prime Minister? It is a key which unlocks the door not only to a large hall but indeed to the universe. It turns us from * outcasts to mainstream players. And, Sir, we have to judge it not by what we may imagine or dream about; we have to judge it not by somebody's fanciful imagination, but by what we can get, what we have got. Sir, we cannot allow the perfect to be the enemy of the good. I shall endeavour, Sir, to deal with each of the issues; important, less important, boring, more sensational, as made by the hon. previous speakers whom I have heard with rapt attention. So, let me start, Sir, with the issue of energy security made by my friend, Mr. Yechury. Sir, the basic point on energy security is that there is no one source of energy on which we can give more focus or more importance. The approach has to be multi-pronged, multi-faceted, and holistic. And that is the complete error, that is the fundamental error, of the arguments which have gone by earlier regarding energy security. Sir, as somebody has said, statistics can be misleading like certain articles of clothing. What they reveal is interesting, what they conceal is vital. But, Sir, statistics can be instructive. Let us start with the *per-capita* energy consumption; — and we measure this in a special measure called KGOE, Kilogram of Oil Equivalent. For India, the KGOE is roughly 515. Sir, that is 16 times less than the US; it is nine times less than Japan; it is eight times less than UK and it is less than many, many other countries in the world, and, of course, of the countries which have nuclear power, we rank almost in the last two or three, globally. Now, the argument made is that at the end of the day, if we have nuclear power, we will have only seven per cent. Six per cent is what Mr. Yechury says. The correct figure is seven per cent. He forgets that even seven per cent would be roughly, — and this is only by 2020, — over 30,000 megawatts, which is an eight-fold increase. It would still be a small percentage because by then our other sources of energy would also be growing. When other sources grow, the nuclear component percentage will remain small. But that is no reason not to have it. Let me give you a startling statistic. In all of our last two or three Five Year Plans, the capacity addition of electricity has been half of what we have projected. We have the figures for the earlier Plans, and in each Plan the actual capacity added by us is half of what we have projected. Now, Sir, if we will have 30,000 MW by 2020 through this deal, if you extrapolate the total amount of energy by 2050 or 2045, the Planning Commission estimates it to be about 1.3 million MW. There is no reason why by 2050, out of the total 1.3 million MW, we should not have 10, 15, 20 per cent by nuclear sources. And, what would be 20 per cent of that? Sir, 20 per cent of that would be the very impressive figure of 2.6 lakh megawatts from nuclear energy. Today's figure is something like 3000 MW. Therefore, the fact that you have energy from other sources, and that you should pursue energy from other sources, cannot ever mean a lackadaisical approach on energy regarding nuclear sources. Why is it that countries like France—of course, it has a very high percentage—countries like Belgium, Sweden, Switzerland and Japan have a high percentage? The lowest figures are 20 per cent for the USA and the UK, 20 per cent being the figure of the total energy met from nuclear sources. These countries are not foolish, these countries are not suicidal. Belgium has 60 per cent, Sweden has 42 per cent, Switzerland has 39 per cent. But the minimum figure, the lower figures for the US, and the UK are still 20 per cent! So, if we aspire to jumpstart our figures to 6 or 7 per cent, what is wrong in that?

My friend, Mr. Yechury mentioned other sources. Well, Sir, the actual procurement from all other sources, if you take the published studies, by 2031, according to the Ministry of Power, we may require 1 million MWs. According to the Planning Commission, we may

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

require 7,78,000 MWs. Let us take the lower figure of the Planning Commission, 7,78,000 MWs. Out of 7,78,000 MWs, the total power projected by coal would be 1,70,000 MWs; by imported coal would be another 80,000 MWs; by gas, including all forms of gas, 90,000 MWs. Adding everything, including hydro, including the unutilised Nepal portion, would be a total of less than 3.5 lakh MWs. These are figures and we may get lost in figures. This is what the point I am making. The point is two-fold. Even by the Planning Commission estimate of 2031, our total sources of all supplies put together, will give us half of our requirement. The total being 7,78,000 MWs and the total available being 3,40,000 MWs or 3.5 lakh MWs. Well, if we can add to it the nuclear source, why should we look a gift horse in the mouth? This 7 per cent is not a static figure. The 7 per cent we believe will increase to 15 per cent by 2050. By 2050, if you have 15 per cent, it is 15 per cent of over 1.2 million MWs, which is over a lakh-and-a-half or 2 lakh MWs. That is the power of nuclear power. Before I leave the issue of energy security, let me tell you a figure published just two days ago by the World Energy Outlook of 2007 which has recorded that from 2005 to 2030, the maximum increase in energy demand will be in two countries, China and India. And, 45 per cent of the total 55 per cent increase in demand in these 25 years will be from India alone! Well, India will be like that because India has a great expectation of the GDP growth. Our growth engine is bound to be powered only by the demand and need for power.

If 55 per cent of the global energy increase is from 2005 to 2030, 45 per cent out of a total of 55 per cent from India alone, what are we doing in India? Are we twiddling our thumbs while China is going rampaging and increasing a huge amount of nuclear energy sources?

Sir, let me turn to costs; it is good to look at costs; it is important to look at costs. But, Sir, just to digress for a moment, the price of crude oil in 1973 was roughly 2 US$ per barrel. Last month, it was 75 US$ per barrel. Well, do my friends ever talk of the price of oil? Do they talk of the cost of oil? *(Interruptions)* Let me come to that, I have not reached that. Have some patience. I am only starting with the price of oil which you, my friends, have been using in this country for the last 30 years at an unaffordable cost. It increases every day. You have no control over it. It is usually an imported item. You have hardly any indigenous sources, but oil is the mainstay of our consumption. We will come to nuclear energy cost in a moment.

Let me talk about the cost. No doubt a coal plant is cheaper at the initial cost. It incidentally has a life of only 25-30 years and, let me tell you, a nuclear plant has 40-50-year life-cycle, but no doubt, a coal plant is cheaper as far as the initial capital cost is concerned. But two points here. Coal is a very transport-intensive product. By the time it reaches you, at what is called the load-centre where you and I can use it, the cost of coal—that is, the relevant cost of coal—comes to around Rs.3 per unit.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN) in the Chair.]

Secondly, coal is highly polluting. You do not add the cost of pollution; you do not add the cost of transport. As against that nuclear, first of all, nuclear is not 11 crores, the figure given by the previous speakers. If you buy nuclear plants from other parts of the world than the USA, it can be significantly cheaper in the region of 8 to 9 crores. But more important than that, the only statistical study published about nuclear plant cost is a study published by Mr. Grover of the DAE. It is a statistical study of 19 countries, which has published and proved that nuclear plants are the cheapest if you even count a 20-year cycle. And remember, a cycle of a nuclear plant is 50 years; the cycle of a coal plant is 20 to 30 years. Let me give you the four conclusions of the study by Dr. Grover published. The report gives ratios on a study in which 19 countries participated. And if you take a lower discount rate of only 5 per cent — I am reading from the report — nuclear power is cheaper as compared to gas in all the 19 countries. Secondly, if you take coal except for South Korea and the USA, nuclear power is

cheaper in all the 19 countries again. If you take 10 per cent discounting, then it is cheaper in more than 15 of the 19 countries. Again let us not get bogged down in details. The point is it is a myth to call a nuclear plant more expensive. Yes, a nuclear plant appears to be more expensive because the initial upfront capital cost is higher. The amortised cost over the cycle of a nuclear plant which is 50 years is not cheaper, it is significantly cheaper than coal even if you do not take the pollution cost of coal, it is significantly cheaper than oil which we import and over which we have no control. It is significantly cheaper than gas; in whose in any case we use mostly oil. And, Sir, let me add, do we know that one GW, i.e., 1000 MW, needs only one tonne of uranium. Uranium what you are going to use 235 for producing one GW of electricity 1000 MW, you need one tonne of uranium. The equivalent coal you need to fire to produce that amount of energy is 3 million tonnes of black coal. That is the equation. So, both the arguments, ignoring the energy security because when you talk of nuclear somebody will point to hydro, somebody will point to coal, somebody will point to gas, that is fallacy. You have to move ahead of all fronts and the 7 per cent argument is the initial argument till 2020, the 7 per cent argument is wrong because in 2040 and 2050 our percentage of 10 or 50 per cent of energy of nuclear energy will be a very large absolute figure. Equally the cost argument is fallacious; it looks at the initial capital cost alone. Let me, Sir, with your permission now turn to a very important part of the argument, the Hyde Act. They Hyde Act has become a kind of hydra-headed monster as far as those who oppose the Bill are concerned and I can understand that because those unfamiliar with the US Constitutional law will find that the Hyde Act is very peculiar, it, in fact, hides more from them than it reveals, and let me explain why. But the story has to start a little before. The story actually has to start with the fundamental difference between the Indian Constitution and to what you and I are used to or the British Parliamentary model which you and I are used to and the American Constitutional model. And the story, therefore, starts on the separation of power principle which is enshrined in the US Constitutions and in particular in article 6 of that Constitution. The point I am making is that under the US Constitution, and I will just read to you, their own Constitution, their own supreme law and the judgements of their own Supreme Court and that law, namely, the US Constitution and the US Supreme Court, the 123 is the supreme law of the land even under US law. In the first place, no conflict will be imagined between the 123 and Hyde. In the event that there is an irreconcilable conflict, the 123 will prevail. That is the law, the Constitution of the US, that is the law of the US Supreme Court and let me read that to you. That is why I can understand that this is why the Hyde Act has this mesmeric influence. First, article 6 of the US Constitution, it is a long article, the relevant part I am reading. I quote, "The Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made or which shall be made..." and the 123 will be a treaty when it is made "...and all treaties made or shall be made under the authority of the US shall be the supreme law of the land and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby anything in the Constitution itself or the laws of that country notwithstanding." In other words, unlike our country where a treaty will give way even to a Parliamentary statute, unlike in our country, where a treaty by India with in another country will give way to the Indian Constitution, in the US scheme of things, a treaty once entered under the Constitution will not be over-ridden even by the US Constitution. The last four words are, "Anything in the Constitution or the laws of any State to the contrary, notwithstanding." So that is point one. So, treaty 123 will become the supreme law of the USA. Point No. 2, if you still don't believe me and if you don't believe the declarations by the US President, let us read the US Supreme Court Law. It is all very easy to express incredulity. But unless you have read the US Constitution and the judgements, you can keep on expressing incredulity. That is wrong. Now, let me read to you a US Supreme Court judgement which clearly says the same thing and there are many judgements...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD (Bihar): Abhishek, will the US Congress accept your proposition? Are you serious about it?

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: Well, I am reading to you the US Constitution and the US Supreme Court law.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: What are you talking about?

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: It is very easy, Mr. Ravi Shankar Prasad, to debunk it. The difference between debunking something and reading the law is obvious from your statement. You obviously have not read the law. For your benefit, let me read the law.*(Interruptions)*.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Please, listen to him.

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: Now, I am reading one out of several judgments. It is obvious that you have not bothered to research US law. It is obvious that you have not bothered to look at your Supreme Court judgements. But, let me, for your benefit, read one. There are three or four judgements of the US Supreme Court and I am only reading one and this is what it says. "When a statute conflicts with a treaty..." and I am not assuming any conflict. I will show in a moment why the Hyde Act does not conflict. But, assume it conflicts. "When a statute conflicts with a treaty, the later of the two enactments prevails over the earlier under the last-in-time rule." In Whitney versus Robertson, the Supreme Court of US said this, "By the Constitution, a treaty is placed on the same footing and made of like obligation as an Act of legislation. Both are declared by the instrument to be the Supreme law of the land and no superior efficacy is given to the law over the treaty. If the two are inconsistent, the later one will prevail. And immediately pause and think why is the sequencing of the 123 agreement, what is now being done?" Have you noticed the sequencing? The sequencing is, a draft 123, that is then a Hyde Act, and after the Hyde Act, this 123 goes back to US Congress. The last in point of time to which the US Congress will affirm and give its seal of approval will be the 123 which is why the last in point of time will prevail. The sequencing of 123 is not accidental. The sequencing is built in because whenever the US legislature intends the treaty to be the last expression of the sovereign will, they take it back to their Congress and the last expression of the sovereign will of the US legislature will be and shall be the 123 treaty, if and when, it is approved by the US legislature, not the Hyde Act.

Now, come to the fourth point. It is wrong to suppose that the Hyde Act, in fact, conflicts. The Hyde Act is seen by you to conflict because you read portions like sections 101. Mr. Sinha, my friend read the whole of the Joint Conference which is about 50 pages. Then, 101, 103 and 109. These are provisions which have what they call 'the sense of the House'. They have provisions which have a statement of policy. These are words from the Hyde Act, not my words. There are words there which say that we must follow a policy of global non-proliferation. We should not allow or encourage Iran or Iraq and that we hope and trust that countries will reduce their nuclear arsenal and so on and so forth. Well, Sir, the Hyde Act, without the 123, even without the 123, has two portions as does every similar US enactment, again unlike our law. Again, unlike our law. And, if you do not know that distinction and if you do not care to find that distinction, you are bound to make this mistake. The two parts are: the Hortatory, the Exhortatory, the Declaratory, the Policy part and the second part is the Prescriptive part. 101, which is called the Sense of the House, 103, which is called Statement of Policy, 109, which talks about the Exhortations about the global non-proliferation and the entirety of the 50 pages...

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE (Uttar Pradesh): 104 which says is prescriptive...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: Absolutely. That is valid. I did not say that. I did not mention 104.

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Then, 106 which says...

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: Mr. Shourie, I agree that 104 and 106 are prescriptive. I have said so. I deal with it...*(Interruptions)*...Let me go to one-by-one.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Shourie, when you get your chance, you speak and reply to these points...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: I am only dealing with 101, 103, 109 and the 50 pages which Mr. Yashwant Sinha read partially on Joint Conference. A Joint Conference is worse than our Statement of Objects and Reasons which we attach to every Bill. It is not prescriptive. It is not binding. It is not applicable at all. My friend reads it chapter and verse for 50 pages. Well. What is applicable? And, why is that? The reason is simple. Under the US law, there is a separation of powers and all parts of a statute are not applicable. Only those parts which are said to be binding are applicable. That is what was clarified categorically twice over even when we had the earlier debate. Even when I was speaking in the earlier debate on 16th June, 2006, it was said by the US Ambassador and then by President Bush himself that we have declared that these parts of the Hyde Act are advisory, are non-binding. This was said by President Bush. It was said by the US Ambassador. And, here, we are saying, 'We will not believe what the US administration says about its own law. We will not believe what the US Supreme Court says about its own treaties. We will not believe what the article 6 of the US Constitution says about its own treaties.' But, we will believe, what we want to believe. I want to say your views about these treaties is like Alice in Wonderland. You want to live in your own dream world.

Sir, article 2(1) of 123 was also read which talks of each party shall implement this agreement in accordance with the respective applicable treaties, national laws and regulations. First of all, the word used is 'applicable treaties.' And, 123 is a treaty. But, secondly, this is a clause only dealing with implementation. It is in the nitty-gritty of getting permissions, of getting authorisations under local laws. For example import taxes, cesses, duties, etc. That is what it means. There is nothing whatsoever to do of what is told to you that it is a hindrance or a bar to activating the 123. There is also a clause 16.4, which is frequently forgotten, in 123. Sir, 16.4 says, 'This Agreement shall be implemented in good faith and in accordance with the principles of international law.' This is a separate ground. This Agreement is supreme under the US Constitution and the US law. But, separately and apart from that, it is also very important under the Vienna Convention, because it shall be implemented in good faith and in accordance with the international law, because it is an international treaty. And, articles 26 and 27 of the Vienna Convention — I remember, although the USA has not ratified it, would be bound by the spirit of Vienna Convention. So, it is completely wrong and misleading to read the Hyde Act as if it is a statute which overrides, which comes into the domestic law, which is written into and incorporated into the 123 is completely misleading.

Sir, may I now turn to the other aspect, which was, of course, partly discussed in the Lower House. It is about China. Is China less concerned about its own sovereignty? Is China less concerned about being overwhelmed by US? The Indo-US Plan Vs the China-US 123, if I may call it, is so striking in its departures that it is worth commenting upon. We are so concerned and so much concerned about being overwhelmed in terms of our sovereignty. I will just give you a few examples as a comparison of the 123 which China has happily begged

for, happily got and happily implementing is ten times more inferior than our 123. And, we are "Looking A Gift Horse In The Mouth." (1) Under the China Agreement, there is a separate Uranium Agreement required with Australia. Nothing they get from the USA as far as Uranium is concerned. So, all their actual consumables and supplies have to come from a third country with which they have to enter a second and very much more a stringent agreement and which is apart from the US. The US promises them nothing.

In India, we get direct supplies and we do not have to go to a third country. We can go to any of the NSG countries.

Secondly, the separation plan in the case of China would have to be worked out jointly, consultatively, between China and Australia because Australia is supplying them Uranium. In other words, Australia has a veto in terms of separation of those plants which China wants to dedicate to military uses, versus, those which China wants to dedicate to civilian use. And, what do we do? We have absolute sovereignty to decide how many we dedicate to military and how many to civilian. Tomorrow, theoretically, we can dedicate all our future plants to military. And, there is no compromise, nobody inspects and nobody comes. And, we say, 'no', this is an assault on our sovereignty.'

No upfront reprocessing permission is granted to China. There is none. Apart from Japan, we are the only country in the world which has an upfront, advance U.S. permission for reprocessing rights subject to safeguards that we will have a separate national reprocessing facility. In any case, China has no agreement like this.

Now, I come to perpetual safeguards. Well, we have absolutely no possibility of any non-IAEA Inspector coming; none. In the China Agreement, there are possibilities and potentialities for U.S. Inspectors and, indeed, even Australian inspectors to visit. There is nothing like that as far as we are concerned. And, why is that? It is because China has decided that it wants to play a major role in the energy demand, which is going to increase in the next 20-30 years, to sustain its 10 per cent, 11 per cent or 9 per cent rate of growth to become truly a dragon and an elephant. It is proposed in China, incidentally, that by 2050 they will have 150 reactors with 1,50,000 MW of energy from nuclear sources alone. Well, I know that we have, and we are proud of that, a democracy. Sometimes, it is a very acceptable and desirable price that democracy has to pay. But, then, we cannot twiddle our thumb while China goes and gets 150 reactors with 1,50,000 MW towards which they are racing. Is it not ironic and interesting that there are only two places on earth which are opposing us tooth and nail? There are only spots on earth which oppose us vehemently. One is China and the other is Pakistan. Is there a reason for it? Is there a pattern to it? Well, ironically, the third place, in a democracy, where we have opposition, is ourselves in India. Well, these are the only three places that have opposition to this Agreement. That is a question which you need to turnover in your minds. Incidentally, the military part of the programme is completely and will remain completely untouched. This is a bogie. Mr. Yashwant Sinha talked of our deterrent. Well, there is absolutely no touching on our deterrent. I will deal with testing in a moment. You can have as many nuclear plants as you want. This is really a separation given by the USA, uniquely, to India. Let me end on this point by saying that, perhaps, today, we have 8 units out of 22, which we kept apart for our military. Well, these eight units or reactors can produce about 200 bombs. Let me assure you that 200 bombs are more than what we need; more than the whole world needs, to bomb ourselves; all of us twice over, out of existence. We don't need any more. We already have eight. But, remember, in case you want more than 200 bombs out of eight reactors, you can have 20 more reactors like that; no questions asked, no inspections.

4:00 P.M.

But, let me come now to an argument, which is equally like a red flag, as the Hyde Act. I have dealt with the Hyde Act. Let me deal with testing now. We have dealt with energy security. We have dealt with cost. We have dealt with the Hyde Act. We have dealt with Indo-China comparisons. The fifth point is about testing. The question put bluntly is: Can we have Pokharan -III after Pokharan - II? The answer categorically, unequivocally, unambiguously is, 'yes, we can.' The question was: Can we do it? Yes, of course, we can do it. Now, do you want affirmative U.S. permission? Do you want affirmative U.S support to do a third test? Can you imagine a world where you will go to the U.S. and say, 'Please support me for doing my third test.' Is that conceivable? Your question is: Can we do it? The answer unequivocally is: 'Yes'. But you want to frame the question in a manner where it appears that the U.S. must go out of its way to pat you on your back and support you for doing the third test.Well, that is not going to happen. Let me tell you something very interesting about testing. You are not able to cite — and I challenge you with utmost respect — a single clause, a single word, a single phrase, in the 123 Agreement, which stops you from testing; answer: nil. Number two, the 123 Agreement, indeed, curiously does not use the word 'test' for explosion at all. I may be wrong, but I have checked it. The word 'test' or 'explosion' is not used in the entire 123 Agreement. I have already demonstrated that the Hyde Act will not override the 123 Agreement; the 123 Agreement is the last expression of the sovereign will. But, now, assume for a minute, that the Hyde Act has anything to do with the subject. The Hyde Act has two parts. One is, an exemption from the old US law, the Atomic Energy Law, and the Hyde Act exempts you by allowing you to get waivers under the old 1954 law. That exemption remains. The rest of the Hyde Act says and he is right that in section 104 and 106, it says that we do not contemplate testing. Now, in the event of your testing, it is not that the 123 Agreement prohibits it. It is a fact that no country in the world will go out of the way to permit you to test, or, will, affirmatively, acknowledge that you can test. That does not mean that you have lost your sovereign right to test. You had the right in 1998 when you, Mr. Sinha, or, your predecessor made the Statement on the United Nation's floor, you had the right in 1999 when your Prime Minister made the Statement of a unilateral moratorium on testing. Let me tell you a good reason why they did so, and that is the same reason why all Governments like us also adhere to it. The reason is, this whole testing phobia is over emphasized. Most countries, in fact, do not need to test. Because we have done all the tests, we want. Do you know, of the nuclear club of five, Britain and France have no testing sites on their soil at all? They have no testing sites; so, they very rarely test. They have not tested for years. Of the balance three, Russia has the site, but it has signed the CTBT, which means Russia is governed on testing issues by the CTBT. Even of the nuclear club, that leaves only two, the USA and China. These two have signed the CTBT, but not ratified it. There is a view that if you sign a treaty and don't ratify, you are still bound by the spirit of that treaty. So, in actual fact, the whole issue of testing is over emphasized. We have many bombs; I don't know how many. We have many military reactors; we don't need to test. But in the unlikely event that your scientists say that you can't live without testing, you have the absolute sovereign right to test. What will happen if you test? Well, if you test, you may have to go through the procedures prescribed under two very significant clauses of the 123 Agreement which are being ignored by you. The two clauses are: Clause 5.6 and clause 14, which is the right to return clause, and, clause 5.6 which you gave an argument about, I am sorry, does not bear out your argument at all. Clause 5.6 gives you full protection in every possible way about continuous supply. Sir, let me just read some parts of clause 5.6. Clause 5.6 starts by saying, "the US has conveyed its commitment to the reliable supply of fuel." You have read a part of it, there is one whole page of seven clauses which reiterates the commitment to

supply. The question you have raised is, if you test and you terminate under 14, what will happen to this right? Remember two things. Under clause 14, you are not required to stop immediately. There is no interruptus, automatically, the moment you test. Clause 14 itself is a significant improvement. I want to ask you a question. When Mrs. Gandhi tested in 1974 and when you tested in 1998, did they not immediately impose sanctions? Well, now, under clause 14, you have a more liberalised regime. They can't do that for one year. Under clause 14, for one year, they have to talk to you. So, you have a much more liberalised regime than you ever had on testing for all these decades. Today, under the 123, it specifically says that if you test, both the countries will talk. There will be a one-year notice period and there will be discussions. It is extraordinary that a Party which swears by the testing of Pokhran in 1998, today, says, "we oppose", despite clause 14 of 123 Agreement which puts a one year gap before any action can be taken. You suffered sanctions on day one after you tested in 1998 and so did Mrs. Gandhi in 1974.

Secondly, and more importantly, you miss the point, the point that 5.6 is specifically not derogated from...*(Interruptions)* Article 5.6, in fact, does not say that it is subject to Article 14. Remember, Article 5.6 is 'uninterrupted continuous fuel supply' and Article 14 is 'termination'. Article 5.6 is not subject to Article 14. Article 14 does not override Article 5.6. On the contrary, Article 14 has a very extraordinary and interesting clause which says, even if we terminate, nothing in Article 5.6 shall be affected, which means that if and while you are terminating the Article 5.6 obligation to continue uninterrupted supplies shall not be touched and that is in 14.8: "It is not the purpose of the provisions of this Article", that is, Article 14, "regarding cessation of cooperation and the right of return to derogate from the rights of the parties under Article 5.6". Did you read this, Mr. Sinha? This is a preservation of Article 5.6. And what is Article 5.6? Article 5.6 is that you shall ensure uninterrupted supplies. Well, that is the meaning of 'uninterrupted supplies' which this Prime Minister and this Government has got for the first time. Both Articles 14 and 5.6 are unique. Of course, it is not realised, frequently not realised, that even signatories to the NPT...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please.

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: ...even those who are signatories to the NPT can have a test, provided they leave the NPT. This is the normal rule; if you want to do some testing, you cannot have it both ways...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No, please.

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: ...you cannot have the benefit and continue testing.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please. Listen to the hon. Member. You can reply when your chance comes.*(Interruptions)* What is the problem?

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: I can understand why some of my friends are uncomfortable and, therefore, they do not want to listen to it. But facts are sacred; facts don't change.*(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please listen.*(Interruptions)* Please.

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: Let me now, in this line of facts, come to what I title 'The * of the BJP'. The true * is defined as one who ceases to perceive his deception and who changes his stand with sincerity.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Singhvi, how many more minutes do you want?

---

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: Five to seven, Sir. I will grant that sincerity to the BJP which makes you a true * . Why are you true * ? That is because you are the ones who started a strategic phase in three particular areas — in civil and nuclear, in civil and space, in hitech trade. You then tangoed, for many years, with Mr. Strobe Talbot. Mr. Strobe Talbot....*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): What is the problem?

DR. FAROOQ ABDULLAH (Jammu and Kashmir): Why don't we really test out these bombs and find out what America does? You say that it would take one year for them to impose sanctions, but believe me, before that one year ends, they will start putting pressure on us in every way....*(Interruptions)*...

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: Dr. Abdullah, that is why...*(Interruptions)*... That is something ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Jothi, please. Dr. Abdullah, please. You will get the chance to speak.*(Interruptions)*

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: We shall come to that. Why don't you allow...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please, address the Chair.

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, can I answer his question by asking a counter question? Why do they not first allow the deal to be signed? We shall cross that bridge when we come to it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, please conclude.

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: Now, you having started the strategic arrangement, Mr. Talbot tangoed for many months and years with the then Foreign Minister and it is very interesting for the then Foreign Minister — whom I always felt, is conspicuous by his absence, on any such debate on nuclear energy — Mr. Jaswant Singh, who never participates in these debates, thereby, hangs a tail. It is a very significant omission but he would have much to say about what was discussed, what was not discussed, why is it that the deal did not go through. Well, thereafter, the BJP changes tack and forgets its own statement made on the United Nations floor and today accuses us on testing issues. After your unilateral moratorium, after your unilateral commitment on the CTBT, how on earth, can you ask us questions about testing, with this Prime Minister having extracted a 5.6 and a 14? Is it not utter * ? On the one hand, you are prepared to have a moratorium, on the other, you are asking us questions about testing.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, please conclude.

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: Lastly, on transparency, my friends from the Left know well that the Prime Minister has made statements on this issue many times; not once, but more than five times, on 29th of July, 27th of February, 7th of March, and so on. The reason they give is that this was made before the passage of the Hyde Act. Well, after the passage of the Hyde Act, more than eight months had passed. Of course, we did not say that we will accept it in toto, but we were surprised by the vehemence of their objections when the process ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please conclude...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: Please give me a couple of minutes. ...*(Interruptions)*...

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No. There is one more speaker. *...(Interruptions)...*

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: This agreement is the first time that India has advance reprocessing right; this agreement is the first time where no fall back safeguards are required; this agreement, on all fronts, is good. I submit, Sir, that those who oppose it must keep an open mind and try to move away from the stated positions to support what is a good agreement in the interests of India. Thank you.

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह (झारखंड) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका बहुत शुक्रगुजार हूं कि आपने मुझे यह मौका दिया और उससे ज्यादा मैं अमर सिंह जी का भी शुक्रगुजार हूं कि उन्होंने अपने से पहले मुझे यह मौका दिया। जब-जब हम लोग सदन में इस सवाल पर बोलने के लिए खड़े हुए हैं तो हमें एक ही बात का दुख और अफसोस होता है कि जब हम अपनी बात कहते हैं तो भारत के प्रधान मंत्री को शक के दायरे में ले आते हैं और मेरे जैसे आदमी को कम से कम जब इस पद पर बैठे हुए व्यक्ति को शक के दायरे में लाने की बात की जाती है तो व्यक्तिगत तौर से मैं खुद दुखी होता हूं। भारत का प्रधान मंत्री किसी दल का प्रधान मंत्री नहीं होता है। जिस दिन उसने इस पद की शपथ ले ली उस दिन वह देश के सौ करोड़ लोगों की इज्जत और गरिमा का प्रतीक होता है और जब उस व्यक्ति के बारे में सदन के अंदर हम शक के दायरे में कोई बात कहें तो एक भारतीय होने के नाते कभी-कभी मुझे भी थोड़ी परेशानी होती है। यह बात मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूं कि पिछले तीन बार से लगातार हम इस सदन में इस बात पर चर्चा कर रहे हैं और चर्चा करने के दरम्यान हमने बार-बार प्रधान मंत्री जी से कहा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी, जो आप कर रहे हैं वह देश के हित में नहीं है। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बार-बार यह कहा कि हम कोई ऐसा काम नहीं करेंगे जिससे देश की इज्जत और गरिमा घटे, संसद की मर्यादा घटे। यही नहीं वाशिंगटन की प्रेस कांफ्रेंस में भी कहा था कि हम वही काम करेंगे जो देश के ज्यादातर लोगों की सहमति से होगा। लेकिन उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे अफसोस है कि प्रधान मंत्री हमारी बात तो छोड़ दें, अमर सिंह और यशवंत सिन्हा जी की बात तो छोड़ दें, लेकिन जिनके भरोसे सरकार चला रहे हैं, उनका भी fo'okl आज उनको नहीं है। हमने इसी संसद के अंदर देखा था कि जब भारत के एक प्रधान मंत्री को जब उनको दूसरे सहयोगी दल कांग्रेस पार्टी का सहयोग और fo'okl प्राप्त नहीं हुआ तो इसी सदन के अंदर देश के वह एक ऐसे प्रधान मंत्री आदरणीय स्वर्गीय चन्द्रशेखर जी थे और जिस दिन उनको यह पता चला कि कांग्रेस पार्टी के सदस्य संसद में उपस्थित नहीं हैं तो इसी सदन के अंदर उन्होंने अपना इस्तीफा तक दे दिया था। यह ताकत होती है प्रधान मंत्री के पद की और आज जो प्रधान मंत्री ऐसी डील करने की बात कह रहा है या सोच रहा है उसको अपने ही सही, जनतंत्र है क्या, जनतंत्र में कौन सी ताकत होती है, बहुमत के सहारे सरकार चलाने का जिसको हक और अधिकार मिल जाए वही भारत का प्रधान मंत्री होता है। क्या आपको अपने वामपंथी दल के लोगों का सहयोग और समर्थन प्राप्त है जो काम आप कर रहे हैं? मैं इस बात को इसलिए कह रहा हूं कि आप दुनिया के देश में, दुनिया की नजरों में हम नीचे गिरते चले जा रहे हैं। भारत का प्रधान मंत्री एक शब्द कहे, सरकार की तरफ से एक बात कही जाए और जो लोगों के भरोसे सरकार चला रहे हों वे दूसरी बात कहें, तो जनतंत्र की ताकत और हैसियत मजबूत नहीं होती। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, औरों की तो बात छोड़ दें, उनके स्वयं के तत्कालीन विदेश मंत्री माननीय नटवर सिंह जी का जो बयान अभी कुछ दिनों पहले अखबारों में छपा है कि हमें डील के बारे में कोई जानकारी नहीं थी और जब व्हाइट हाउस में पहुंचा तो हमें डील का कागज पकड़ा दिया गया और उतना ही नहीं जो यू0पी0ए0 की चेयरमैन थी उन्होंने नटवर सिंह जी से पूछा कि यह डील तुमने किसको और कैसे पूछ कर किया। यह बात मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूं कि नटवर सिंह जी का यह बयान इंडियन एक्सप्रेस में प्रकाशित हो चुका है। और उसके बाद भी सरकार सोचती है कि वह डील सर्वानुमति से कर रही है, तो हम सब लोग कहां और किस तरफ जा रहे हैं, इसका अंदाजा लगाया जाए। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यहां पर बहुत काबिल लोग हैं, प्रणब मुखर्जी इस देश के विदेश मंत्री हैं, पिछले कई वर्षों से सरकारों को चलाने का अनुभव और तजुर्बा उनके साथ है। क्या विदेश मंत्री जी इस बात का जवाब मुझे दे पाएंगे तथा क्या आप उस देश के विदेश मंत्री रहेंगे जिसके प्रधान मंत्री को आप पर fo'okl न हो और जब प्रधान मंत्री यह कहें कि हम कौन सा कार्यक्रम अपनी विदेश नीति में करने जा रहे हैं उसकी जानकारी आपको न हो। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस

बात को सदन के सामने इसलिए रखना चाहता हूं कि इण्डो-यू0एस0 न्यूक्लीअर डील के बारे में यह सदन स्पष्ट तौर पर अपनी राय कई बार बता चुका है। एक बार नहीं सहयोगी दल और समर्थन करने वाले लोगों ने बता रखा है और उसके बाद प्रधान मंत्री इस डील को करना चाहते हैं। तो या तो सरकार की तरफ से * हो रही है या हम लोगों की तरफ से कोई नादानी हो रही है। आप इस डील को करवाने के लिए दुनिया के उन मंचों पर किस मुंह से जा रहे हो, जहां पर आप भारत का प्रतिनिधित्व कर रहे हो? जब आपको आपके ही सहयोगी लोगों का समर्थन प्राप्त नही है, तो किस मुंह से दुनिया को यह बताने जा रहे हो कि हम इस न्यूक्लीयर डील को करने जा रहे हैं? उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज इस देश की राजनीति की स्थिति किस तरह से लाकर खड़ी कर दी गई है कि बाहर के लोग आकर हमको बता रहे हैं कि यह डील आपके देश के हित में है। यह आपके राष्ट्रीय हित में है, अमेरीका के लोग आकर बताते हैं, उसका एम्बेसडर बताता है। कोकटेल पार्टियों में कहा जाता है कि नहीं-नहीं जो लोग इस डील का विरोध कर रहे हैं, उनको देश के हित की चिंता नहीं है। और तो और सरकार की तरफ से भी यह कहा जाता है कि हम नादान लोग हैं। जिन्होंने डील का समर्थन नहीं किया है, वे नादान लोग हैं। हां, हम नादान लोग हैं, क्योंकि हम इसी साल हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी की लड़ाई की शुरुआत की 150वीं साल मना रहे हैं। उन आजादी की लड़ाई के दीवानों ने हमें यह समझाया और बताया था कि भारत की इज्जत और गरिमा को बचाने के लिए दुनिया में जिस भी ताकत के साथ मुकाबला करना हो, तो उसके सामने कभी सिर झुकाने की जरूरत नहीं है। हमको यह बताया गया था, इसलिए हम नादान लोग हैं। इसीलिए हमारे वामपंथी लोग नादान हैं, आप उनको कह सकते हो। इसलिए आप हमें नादान लोग कह सकते हो कि हम भारत के सौ करोड़ लोगों की इज्जतत और गरिमा के साथ लड़ने को तैयार खड़े हैं। इसका यह मतलब नहीं है कि हम कांग्रेस पार्टी के लोगों को कह रहे हैं कि आप देशभक्त लोग नहीं हो। आप तो देशभक्त हो। कौन कहता है कि आप देशभक्त नहीं हो? कांग्रेस का इतिहास, कांग्रेस की विरासत, पोखरन-1 हमने नहीं किया था, पोखरन-1 तो श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने किया था। दुनिया के सामने आजादी की लड़ाई से पहले और आजादी की लड़ाई के बाद, इस देश के प्रधान मंत्री पं0 जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने कहा था कि दुनिया में जहां भी आजादी बराबरी की होगी, colonialism के खिलाफ होगी, तो हम उस लड़ाई में साथ देंगे। आपको अपने पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री और देश के बड़े नेताओं के प्रति कोई आस्था नहीं है। आप पं0 जवाहर लाल की बात याद नहीं कर रहे हो, आप उस राष्ट्रपति की बात याद कर रहे हो, जिसने दुनिया के सबसे बड़े मंच, यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में जाकर कहा था कि इराक के पास Weapons of Mass Destruction है, इसलिए हमें लड़ाई करने का मौका दो, युद्ध करने का मौका दो और दुनिया में वह राष्ट्रपति * साबित हुआ है। आप उसें पर ही यकीन कर रहे हो, हमें दुख और अफसोस है, तो इस बात का है। क्या राष्ट्रपति बुश ने यह बात नहीं कही थी? क्या उनके विदेश मंत्री ने यूनाइटेड नेशन्स में यह बात नहीं कही थी कि इराक के पास Weapons of Mass Destruction है। आप उनकी बात का यकीन कर रहे हो, लेकिन सीताराम येचुरी की बात का यकीन नहीं कर रहे हो। आपको उन पर भरोसा है, लेकिन अपने वामपंथी दल के सहयोगियों पर भरोसा नहीं है। हम यह बात आपके सामने इसलिए रखना चाहते हैं कि हम यह जानना चाहते हैं कि सचमुच प्रधान मंत्री करना क्या चाहते हैं? मैं यह बात इसलिए कह रहा हूं कि प्रधान मंत्री का पद दायित्व से भरा है। मैं इसलिए इस बात का जिक्र करना चाहता हूं कि यहां एनर्जी का एक हौवा खड़ा किया जा रहा है। यह कोई पहली बार नहीं किया गया है। जब डा. मनमोहन सिंह जी इस देश में वित्त मंत्री बने थे, तब भी एनर्जी का हौवा खड़ा किया गया था और दाभोल का इनरॉन प्रोजेक्ट तैयार किया गया था। आप इसको मत भूलिये और यह सदन भी इस दाभोल के एनरॉन प्रोजेक्ट को नहीं भूला है। देश कैसे बिका और आज प्रोजेक्ट की क्या हालत है, आपको क्या इसका अंदाजा है? वह एनरॉन कहां पर है? क्या वह देश छोड़कर चला गया, बिजली का कारखाना बंद हो गया? सीताराम येचुरी ने बिल्कुल सही बात कही है, मैं उससे एक कदम आगे बढ़कर कहना चाहूंगा कि आज इस देश में बिजली उत्पादित करने की बड़ी ताकत और क्षमता मौजूद है। भारत का प्रधान मंत्री लाल किले से कहता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की गरीबी तब तक दूर नहीं हो सकती, जब तक दक्षिण एशिया में गरीबी मौजूद रहेगी। यह बात सही है, अगर नेपाल गरीब रहेगा, बंगलादेश गरीब रहेगा और श्रीलंका गरीब रहेगा, तो भारत आर्थिक रूप से ताकतवर और अमीर देश नहीं बन

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

सकता है। अगर आप सचमुच एनर्जी के लिए, बिजली, पानी के लिए व्याकुल हो, तो नेपाल की नदियां जो भारत में आकर बिहार और उत्तर प्रदेश में तबाही और बर्बादी का रास्ता अपना लेती हैं, उतना ही पैसा 40 मिलियन, जिसका जिक्र सीताराम येचुरी जी ने किया है, दो लाख हजार करोड़ रुपया, अगर आप उस पर खर्चा कर दो, तो सिर्फ उस पैसे से 80 हजार मेगावाट बिजली का इंतजाम हो सकता है। एक बड़े प्रोजेक्ट की साढ़े पांच हजार मेगावाट बिजली आज भी कहां पर है, हम लोगों को नहीं मालूम है। और आप तैयारी कर रहे हैं कि स्वीडन में बिजली कैसे बनाई जाती है। सिंघवी साहब उधर चले गए, वे स्वीडन की बिजली की बात कर रहे हैं। आपको स्वीडन की per capita income मालूम है, वहाँ के एक मजदूर और प्रधान मंत्री के तन्ख्वाह का ratio मालूम है! वहाँ मजदूर को 5.5 हजार, 6 हजार क्रोनर मिलता है और वहाँ के प्रधान मंत्री की तन्ख्वाह 7.5 हजार क्रोनर है। यह मजदूर और प्रधान मंत्री के तन्ख्वाह में फर्क है और आप तुलना भारत की कर रहे हैं? स्वीडन कहाँ है और हम कहाँ खड़े हैं, क्या आपको इसकी जानकारी है?

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपसे पूछना और जानना चाहता हूँ ...**(व्यवधान)**... स्वीडन की बात अभिषेक मनु सिंघवी साहब ने कही थी, इसलिए मैंने उसका जिक्र किया था। आप नहीं सुन रहे होंगे। इसलिए मैं आपसे कहना चाह रहा हूँ कि आप किन बातों को करना चाहते हैं, इसकी प्राथमिकता तो तय करो। मुझे यह भी मालूम है कि पता नहीं, सीताराम जी, आपका सहयोग इनको कब तक मिलेगा? आपका हमसे झगड़ा है, एनडीए के लोगों से झगड़ा है, भारतीय जनता पार्टी के लोगों से झगड़ा है। वह झगड़ा तो बरकरार रहेगा और रहना भी चाहिए। आप अपने उसूल पर कायम रहो और हमसे लड़ते रहो, जो आपके सवाल हैं, उनके बारे में हमसे जूझते रहो, हमें कोई ऐतराज नहीं। यही भारत के प्रजातंत्र की, आजादी की ताकत है कि आपको लड़ने का हक और अधिकार है। लेकिन याद रखिएगा और यह बात मैं कांग्रेस के लोगों से भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह कोई महज, आप यह मत समझिएगा कि एक्सीडेंट हो गया है या यह कोई co-incident है या घटना मात्र है। आज जिस तरह से दक्षिण एशिया में जो लोग ऊँचे पदों पर बैठे हुए हैं, वे कौन लोग हैं, आप इसका ज़रा अंदाजा लगा लीजिए। प्रणब मुखर्जी जी, आपकी जितनी राजनीतिक अक्ल है, जितना राजनीतिक काम का अनुभव है, उतनी तो मेरी उम्र है। इसलिए मैं आपको क्या समझा सकता हूँ। छोटा मुँह बड़ी बात करने की आदत मुझमें नहीं है, लेकिन आप इस बात को गम्भीरता से कब सोचेंगे? यह मुल्क कांग्रेस पार्टी और बीजेपी पार्टी से बड़ा है। प्रधान मंत्री आएगा, जाएगा, लेकिन यह देश रहेगा। सोवियत संघ में एक व्यक्ति आया था, जिसने सोवियत संघ को तोड़ कर हजारों टुकड़ों में बाँट दिया। उस समय लोगों को लगा था कि बड़ा क्रांतिकारी कदम उठाया जा रहा है। पद पर बैठा हुआ आदमी कभी-कभी ...**(व्यवधान)**... मैं किसी पद के बारे में नहीं बोल रहा हूँ, मैं सबके बारे में बोल रहा हूँ। कल आप वहाँ पर थे, परसों यशवंत सिन्हा जी वहीं पर बैठे हुए थे। वे उधर से इधर आ गए। इसका यह मतलब नहीं हुआ कि आप देशभक्त हो गए और वे देशद्रोही हो गए या वे देशभक्त हैं और आप देशद्रोही हैं। मैं इस बात को कभी नहीं कह सकता, सोच भी नहीं सकता। लेकिन मैं इतना जरूर सोचता हूँ कि आने वाली चुनौतियाँ बड़ी हैं। आप तो विदेश मंत्री हैं। नेपाल हमारा पड़ोसी देश है। कल नेपाल की सरकार ने चीन से कहा कि आप काठमांडू तक रेलवे की लाइन बिछा दो। सीताराम जी की बड़ी दिलचस्पी है, हम सब लोगों की दिलचस्पी है नेपाल में। हर हालत में नेपाल हमारे साथ रहने वाला है - सांस्कृतिक, आर्थिक, राजनीतिक, पड़ोसी, जियो-पॉलिटिकल, सोशल, कल्चरल। आज उस देश में भी कहा जा रहा है कि चीन से रेलवे लाइन बिछाओ और काठमांडू तक ले आओ। हम 60 वर्षों में सिर्फ रक्सौल से बीरगंज तक एक 6 किलोमीटर की रेलवे लाइन बिछा पाए हैं और वह भी उनका कंटेनर डिपो बनाने के लिए। मैं यह बात आपसे कह रहा हूँ कि सोचने की जरूरत अभी अमेरिका के ऊपर कम है, अपने इर्द-गिर्द होने वाली घटनाओं पर जरा ध्यान देंगे। हम यह नहीं कहते कि भारत इस देश की तरह ही ढह जाएगा या गिर जाएगा, लेकिन हम इतना जरूर कह सकते हैं कि आज हमें इनसे कुछ सबक लेनी चाहिए। उस सबक में कभी अमेरिका हमारा साथी होगा, हम इस बात को मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं। 60 साल के इतिहास में पंडित जवाहर लाल, इन्दिरा गाँधी, even मोरारजी, कार्टर को बड़ी उम्मीद थी कि मोरारजी अमेरिकापरस्त हैं, कार्टर इसी उम्मीद से दिल्ली आए थे कि मोरारजी के हाथों से एनपीटी के ऊपर दस्तखत करा लेंगे, क्योंकि वे कम्युनिस्ट विरोधी हैं। लेकिन जब जिम्मी कार्टर आए, तो मोरारजी भाई ने कहा कि हाँ, हम कम्युनिस्टों के विरोधी तो हैं, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की मिट्टी की कसम हमने खाई है और इसलिए

हम तुम्हारे साथ किसी भी तरह से एनपीटी पर समझौता नहीं कर सकते। यह है इस देश की ताकत। जो अमेरिकापरस्त प्रधान मंत्री माना जाता था और मोरारजी भाई खुल कर बोलते थे, उन्हें कहने में कोई हिचक नहीं होती थी। वे कहते थे कि सोवियत संघ बेकार है, अमेरिका हमारा सहयोगी होने वाला है। उस प्रधान मंत्री में भी इतनी हिम्मत और ताकत थी। अभी तो अखबारों में छप चुका है।

अब इस देश में एक अजब बात हो रही है। अब हमारे नेताओं को, अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी को समझाने के लिए प्रधान मंत्री गए तो गए, सीआईआई के लोग भी जा रहे हैं। बिज़नेस घराने के लोग बताने के लिए जा रहे हैं, पूंजीपति बताने के लिए जा रहे हैं कि अटल जी, यह देश के हित में है। हम लोग प्रधान मंत्री जी की तरफ से तो नादान बताए ही जा रहे हैं, किन्तु अब ये पूंजीपति भी हमको नादान बता रहे हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारी हालत यह होती जा रही है **(समय की घंटी)** हम आपका ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहते हैं, लेकिन हम आपसे इतना जरूर कहना चाहते हैं ...**(व्यवधान)**

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे.कुरियन): प्लीज़, कन्क्लूड करिए।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: और खास करके श्री प्रणब मुखर्जी जी से कहना चाहते हैं, चूंकि आज वह इस सदन में हैं। पता नहीं प्रधान मंत्री जी को क्या हो गया, लेकिन विश्वास तो उनके ऊपर था।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, देखिए एक बात और भी ध्यान रहे कि इस देश में सारी न्यूक्लियर पॉलिसी और उसके प्रोग्राम का बटन प्रधान मंत्री के हाथ में होता है। भारत के राष्ट्रपति को भी उसकी जानकारी नहीं रहती है। प्रणब मुखर्जी विदेश मंत्री हैं, यशवंत सिन्हा जी भी विदेश मंत्री रह चुके हैं, हम लोग भी रह चुके हैं, लेकिन किसी को कुछ मालूम नहीं, लालू जी को भी मालूम नहीं। वह सिर्फ प्रधान मंत्री जी को मालूम है। उस पद के ऊपर देश का विश्वास होता है और अगर प्रधान मंत्री ही आज इस शक के घेरे में हैं और इस दायरे में हैं तो यकीन मानिए कि हम देश को मज़बूत नहीं बना रहे हैं। इसलिए हमारी आपसे गुजारिश है, सीताराम येचुरी जी तो अपना काम करेंगे, वृंदा जी अपना काम करेंगी, **(समय की घंटी)** सरकार के बारे में आप लोगों को जो करना होगा, कीजिएगा। हम उस पर कुछ नहीं कह सकते हैं, लेकिन हम इतना जरूरत कह सकते हैं...**(व्यवधान)**

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे.कुरियन): प्लीज़, कन्क्लूड करिए।

श्री दिग्विजय सिंह: सर, बस मैं कन्क्लूड कर रहा हूं। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इतना कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर प्रधान मंत्री और ये हुकूमत के लोग सचमुच प्रजातांत्रिक हैं, डेमोक्रेसी में सचमुच इनका यकीन है तो आज सदन में लालू जी जहां बैठे हैं, उस हिस्से से इस हिस्से तक के लोग विरोध में खड़े हैं। प्रधान मंत्री जी को सचमुच अगर जनतंत्र की ताकत और शक्ति की समझ है तो इस डील को तत्काल रोकें। भले ही सीताराम येचुरी जी ने उनको ऑनरेबल एक्ज़िट का मौका दिया है, लेकिन इस सदन के माध्यम से हम उनसे यह मांग करते हैं कि इससे उनकी गरिमा, उनका पद और उनका व्यक्तित्व बढ़ेगा, अगर वह न्यूक्लियर डील को सिरे से खारिज कर दें और देश की ताकत और एकता को मज़बूत करें। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ, मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Okay, thank you. Dr. Maitreyan. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI AMAR SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, what are you doing? It is my turn ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No, no. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, Digvijay Singhji has mentioned my name. I would like to respond. I can do so at the end of the debate. What he stated is factual reality.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You will be given some time. ...*(Interruptions)*... I will sort it out. In fact, on your agreement ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI AMAR SINGH: No, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*... I have not given my time to him. ...*(Interruptions)*. .I have not given my time to him. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No, no. That is coming to you. ...*(Interruptions)*... Let me clarify ...*(Interruptions)*... Please ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI AMAR SINGH: No, Sir, I will not speak. I am boycotting. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): There is no problem. ...*(Interruptions)*... You can speak. ...*(Interruptions)*... Come on, you speak. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: What is this, Sir?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): I am not denying you. ...*(Interruptions)*.. I have not denied you. ...*(Interruptions)*.. You have misunderstood me. I have not denied you. ...*(Interruptions)*... It is not like that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI VIRENDRA BHATIA (Uttar Pradesh): He tried to adjust Mr. Digvijay Singh. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Hon. Members, please take your seats. ...*(Interruptions)*... I was given to understand your chance is given and when his chance comes you will speak. ...*(Interruptions)*... That is what I thought. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): I agree. ...*(Interruptions)*... It is agreed. ...*(Interruptions)*... It is for Mr. Amar Singh to decide. Nobody has to interfere ...*(Interruptions)*... I only thought like this. If he wants to speak, I am permitting him. ...*(Interruptions)*... What is the problem? ...*(Interruptions)*... I thought like that because ...*(Interruptions)*...

प्रो. राम देव भंडारी: सर, अगर चलना है तो सीरियल से चलिए। ...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): I was not informed ...*(Interruptions)*... Let me clarify. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please, don't misunderstand me. ...*(Interruptions)*...

प्रो. राम देव भंडारी: सर अगर आप सीरियल तोड़ते हैं तो दूसरों के लिए भी तोड़ना चाहिए ...**(व्यवधान)**...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): सभी को चांस मिलेगा, आप बैठिए ...**(व्यवधान)** नहीं, नहीं, सभी को चांस मिलेगा, प्लीज आप बैठिए ..**(व्यवधान)**... आप इतने सीनियर मैम्बर हैं, आप बैठिए ...**(व्यवधान)**... Amar Singhji, please don't Misunderstand. I thought that when you agreed for him to speak, you would speak when his turn comes.

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT (West Bengal): No, no, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No, no. I agree. ...*(Interruptions)*... I thought like that. That is all. If it is not so, I have no problem. ...*(Interruptions)*... But, why do you say 'No'. Why did Brindaji say no? ...*(Interruptions)*... Amar Singhji can say what he wants to say...*(Interruptions)*... Let Amar Singhji say this ...*(Interruptions)*... You don't speak...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI AMAR SINGH: Comrade Brinda Karat....*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): I am sorry. I misunderstood it....*(Interruptions)*... Maybe I misunderstood it....*(Interruptions)*... The fact is that you agreed to let him speak and gave your chance....*(Interruptions)*... I thought you would speak when his chance would come....*(Interruptions)*... You can speak now.

श्री अमर सिंह: सर, सौभाग्य से समाजवादी पार्टी के सदस्यों की संख्या अभी भी इस सदन में 16 है। मैं इस संख्या पर नहीं जा रहा हूँ कि मुझे कब अवसर मिलना चाहिए। आपकी कृपा है, जब भी आप अवसर दे दें।

अभी थोड़ी बदमज़गी हो गई, इसके लिए माफी चाहता हूँ, लेकिन आज की चर्चा का माहौल ही कुछ ऐसा रहा। चर्चा का स्तर कुछ इस तरह से चला-बढ़ा कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री, तुम्हारे प्रधान मंत्री। महोदय, प्रधान मंत्री हमारा या तुम्हारा नहीं होता है। प्रधान मंत्री देश का होता है। प्रधान मंत्री आज कोई है, कल कोई और होगा। फिर चर्चा का स्तर चलने लगा कि कौन किसका पी0ए0 था, कौन किसके कमरे में कब सिफारिश करने आ गया। मैं बहुत छोटा आदमी हूँ ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री लालू प्रसाद : आप छोटे कब से हो गए ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री अमर सिंह : मैं बहुत छोटा आदमी हूँ, इसलिए मेरा भी पोस्टमार्टम हो, तो मैं स्पष्ट कह देना चाहता हूँ कि इतने बड़े लोगों के बीच में मेरी कोई हैसियत नहीं है। यहाँ लालू जी बैठे हैं, कपिल सिब्बल जी बैठे हैं, अभिषेक मनु सिंघवी जी बैठे हैं और श्री राम जेठमलानी जी भी बैठे हैं। ये सब लोग पेशे से बड़े-बड़े वकील हैं। सेक्शन, क्लॉज़, सब-क्लॉज़ की जितनी जानकारी इनको है ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद : उनके पास लॉ की डिग्री भी है...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री अमर सिंह : यह तो सुप्रीम कोर्ट बार एसोसिएशन के मैम्बर भी हैं। अब तो आपकी कृपा से यह इतने मुकदमें झेल चुके हैं कि इनको महारत हासिल हो गई है ...**(व्यवधान)**...

महोदय, मैं बताना चाहता हूँ, इसके पहले कि कोई और बताए, मेरा सौभाग्य है कि आदरणीय प्रणब मुखर्जी जी के नेतृत्व में मैं एक छोटे कार्यकर्ता के रूप में काम कर चुका हूँ। लोग बताएa कि यह तो कार्यकर्ता रहे, तो मैं उनका भी कार्यकर्ता रहा हूँ। देश के भविष्य के बारे में, न्यूक्लियर कार्यक्रम के बारे में, प्रिटेक्स्ट, कांटेक्स्ट और टेक्स्ट के बारे में, सीताराम येचुरी जी ने बहुत लम्बा बयान दिया है। मुझे इसका अनुभव नहीं है और न ही एक्सपोज़र है। यशवन्त सिन्हा जी तो विदेश मंत्री रहे हैं, उनको लम्बा प्रशासनिक अनुभव है, कॉमरेड येचुरी सरकार चला ही रहे हैं, यू0पी0ए0 और लेफ्ट की कोऑर्डिनेशन कमेटी की मीटिंग है। हमारे यहाँ 16 हों और 40 लगभग लोक सभा में हों, तो सरकार इसमें हमसे कोई बात नहीं करती है। इसलिए हमारी जो जानकारी है, वह वृंदा जी और कॉमरेड कारत जी कभी-कभी बता देते हैं कि ऐसा हो रहा है, उतने तक ही सीमित है। इसलिए अगर हमारी समझ में कोई गलती हो, नासमझी हो, तो उसका थोड़ा-बहुत दोष आप इन पर भी दे सकते हैं। न तो विरोधी दल के नेता श्री जसवन्त सिंह जी की तरह स्ट्रोब टालबोट के साथ हमारी कोई मुलाकात ही हुई है ...**(व्यवधान)** .. खैर, यहाँ उनका तो कोई संदर्भ ही नहीं है।

यहाँ पर हाइड एक्ट और 123 एग्रीमेंट की बात हो रही है। अभिषेक मनु सिंघवी जी ने भारत की संसद में, अमेरिका के कानून के बारे में हमको विस्तार से बताया कि अमेरिका के कानून में यह है, यह है और यह है, 123 कितना शास्वत है, हाइड एक्ट से कितना अलग-थलग है। उनकी बात सुनते समय मुझे एक बात याद आ रही थी कि यह भारत की संसद है और यहाँ अमेरिका की चर्चा हो रही है।

मुखलिस है, सितमगर है, कातिल है, प्यारा है।
कुछ भी हो सबब उसका, लेकिन यह शख्स हमारा है।।

इरान हो जाए, इराक हो जाए, अफगानिस्तान हो जाए इराक में कह दिया कि मास डिस्ट्रक्शन का वैपन है, बाद में पता चला कि वह नहीं मिला है। आज ही हमारे साथी श्री शाहिद सिद्दिकी मुझे एक रिपोर्ट दिखा रहे थे कि अमेरिका की इंटेलिजेंस के रिपोर्ट में बताया गया है कि इरान के ऊपर जो अरोप लग रहा है, उसमें भी कोई सच्चाई नहीं है। यानी अमेरिका के लोगों ने ही, अमेरिका के सिस्टम ने ही, ईरान के ऊपर लगाई गई तोहमत को नकार दिया है। अमेरिका के ही ज्यादा-से-ज्यादा जनसंख्या के लोगों को बुश साहब के प्रशासन का कोई मुगालता नहीं है। लेकिन सदन के पटल पर बार-बार भारत की स्वायत्तता के बारे में, संप्रुभता के बारे में आश्वासन देने के बावजूद जो बात सामने आई है, उस में टैक्नॉलोजी ट्रांसफर, फ्युअल सप्लाई, विदेश नीति, अन-इंटरप्टेड फ्युअल सप्लाई — इन सभी मुद्दों पर भारी विवाद की स्थिति है। आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा कि nuclear cycle in entirety, लेकिन यह मेरी समझ से बिल्कुल उल्टा है। यह एकदम selective है। हमारी समझ से यह regime और technology denial से हम मेनस्ट्रीम न्युक्लिअर एरिना में जा रहे हैं, ऐसा दावा हम लोग कर रहे हैं, लेकिन ऐसा कहां है? तारापुर का कटु अनुभव हमारे

सामने है। Uninterrupted fuel supply की जगह हम को मिल रहा है, termination का क्लॉज। रिएक्टर फ्युअल सप्लाई और इक्युपमेंट, टर्मिनेशन के साथ तुरंत सब खत्म हो जाएगा। महोदय, 123 एग्रीमेंट और हाइड एक्ट — इनमें कोई अंतर नहीं है। दोनों का एक दूसरे में बिल्कुल समावेश है। इंटरनेशनल एटॉमिक एजेंसी से perpetuity का एग्रीमेंट हम करेंगे, लेकिन न्युक्लिअर फ्युअल सप्लाई के लिए perpetuity का कोई समझौता हमारे पास नहीं है।

मुझे अमेरिका के लोगों से, वहां के शहरों से, वहां कभी-कभी जया जी के साथ गया हूं ब्रॉडवेक में, न्यूयार्क में टाइम्स स्क्वैयर के शोज से, मुझे कोई परहेज नहीं है। मुझे बहुत अच्छे लगते हैं, लेकिन जॉर्ज बुश की जो साम्राज्यवादी नीतियां हैं, बहुसंख्यक अमेरिकी नागरिकों की तरह वे मुझे भी पसंद नहीं हैं। राम जेठमलानी जी मुझे माफ कर दें। ठीक वैसे ही, जैसे डा0 मनमोहन सिंह जी, हमारे साथी रामगोपाल जी ने कहा कि बहुत ऑनरेबल हैं, मैं भी कहता हूं कि बहुत ऑनरेबल हैं, लेकिन वे जो डील भारत के लिए कर रहे हैं, यह बिल्कुल ऑनरेबल नहीं है। यह ऑनरेबल इसलिए नहीं है क्योंकि यह डील हमारे हित में नहीं है। यह एक नए मिलिटरी स्टेटस, रीजनल आर्किटेक्चर, नेवल एक्सरसाइज के आधार पर बनाई जाने वाली डील है और इस डील का फायदा दक्षिण-पूर्व एशिया की राजनीति में साम्राज्यवादी अमेरिका अपने लिए करना चाहता है। महोदय, एक ^हाइड साहब^ बहुत थे हमारी नींद खराब करने के लिए, लेकिन हाइड साहब के एक भाई ^हेनरी साहब^ भी आ गए और हेनरी साहब, माफ कीजिए यशवंत सिन्हा जी, आप के नेता के यहां पहुंच गए। पहली बार ऐसा हुआ कि हेनरी किसिंजर, सी0आई0आई0,फिक्की, कल हमारे एक दोस्त हम से मिले, उन्होंने भी कहा क्या कर रहे हो, बहुत बधाई। मैंने पूछा किस बात की बधाई? वह बोले, तुम्हारे नेता ने लोक सभा में बहुत ढीला बयान दिया। कॉमरेड येचुरी, बुरा न मानिएगा, शुरू से जब हमारी आप की बात हो रही थी, कॉमरेड कारत से भी बात हो रही थी तो आप ने कहा कि हम तो इंटरनेशनल एजेंसी में इंडिया स्पेसिफिक के लिए भी जाने की इज़ाजत नहीं देंगे। पता नहीं, ऐसी कौनसी मजबूरी आ गयी कि आपने इज़ाजत दे दी और उस इज़ाजत के बाद हमारे राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा सलाहकार और अखबार के पन्नों में ठीक उसी तरह से दुष्प्रचार चलने लगा, जैसे कि हमारे नेता रामगोपाल के लिए चलने लगा कि समाजवादी पार्टी ढीली हो गयी। यह ठीक उसी तरह से चलने लगा कि वामपंथी भी ढीले हो गए ...(व्यवधान)...सुषमा जी, बिल्कुल नहीं हुए। यह आरोप लगाना ठीक नहीं है और इसलिए ठीक नहीं है कि बीच में एक दिन आदरणीय आडवाणी जी के लिए भी निकल गया था कि वह ढीले हो गए।

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : उन्होंने मना कर दिया था।

श्री अमर सिंह : तो दूसरे दिन प्रकाश कारत जी ने भी मना कर दिया था कि ढीले नहीं हुए हैं। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि कम से कम आज के दिन आप सरकार की कुर्सी में बैठे हुए लोगों को बधाई देना चाहिए कि ब्रोडली उन्होंने यशवंत सिन्हा, कॉमरेड येचुरी और अमर सिंह की आवाज को एक कर दिया है। यही सेन्स ऑफ हाऊस है। यह हाइड की बात नहीं है, यह हेनरी किसिंजर की बात नहीं है, यह सीआईआईए और फिक्की की बात नहीं है, चाहे वह दक्षिण-पंथी हों या वाम-पंथी हों, ...(व्यवधान)...

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : चाहे मध्य-पंथी हों।

श्री अमर सिंह : हम मध्य-पंथी नहीं हैं, हम वाम से नजदीक हैं और दक्षिण से थोड़ा दूर, हम सब लोग आज "मिले सुर मेरा तुम्हारा, तो सुर बने हमारा" और एक सुर बनकर के एक स्वर में कह रहे हैं और इसलिए कह रहे हैं कि इस नए परिवेश में एशियन नाटो के लिए, अमरीका के लिए सिर्फ इंडो-यूएस न्यूक्लीयर डील नहीं, एग्रीकल्चर, एजुकेशन, एकोनोमी पोलिटिक्स पर विश्व के व्यापक मानचित्र में यह डील एक छोटा सा टुकड़ा मात्र है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, पाकिस्तान को भारत के मुकाबले संतुलित करने वाला देश अमरीका रहा है। जब भी हमारे साथ पाकिस्तान का विवाद हुआ है, आज अभिषेक जी ने पाकिस्तान और चीन की चर्चा की है, लेकिन क्या यह सत्य नहीं है कि हरदम पाकिस्तान और भारत के मुकाबले, चीन की बात अभी जाने दे, अमरीका का साफ हाथ हमेशा पाकिस्तान के सिर पर रहा है। अभी यहां शंघाई की बात हो रही थी। शंघाई की बात करते हुए प्रधान मंत्री जी खड़े हुए और उन्होंने कहा कि उन वजहों से हम शंघाई नहीं गए और वे वजह उन्होंने

अपनी मर्यादा और गरिमा की बताई। मैं बहुत आदर से आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहूंगा, प्रणब दा से पूछना चाहूंगा कि जी-8 देश में प्रधान मंत्री जी फिर क्यों जाते हैं? एक और प्रश्न यहां पर उठा, प्रधान मंत्री जी ने स्पष्टीकरण देते हुए कहा कि रशिया से हमारा एग्रीमेंट इसलिए नहीं हुआ कि जब तक हमारा न्यूक्लीयर सप्लाई ग्रुप से, आईएईए से समझौता न हो जाए, तब तक रशिया से एग्रीमेंट नहीं हो सकता, तो फिर यह बात अमरीका के ऊपर लागू क्यों नहीं है? जिस तरह से अमरीका को आप आधार बनाकर एनएसजी में और आईएईए में जा रहे हैं, वह आधार आपने अपने परंपरागत मित्र रूस को क्यों नहीं बनाया? रूस की यात्रा में आदरणीय प्रधान मंत्री जी के साथ esa मेरे मित्र और कॉमरेड येचुरी जी, आपके भी मित्र 'द हिन्दू' के संपादक राम साहब गए थे और राम साहब का मैंने एक आर्टिकल पढ़ा। उस आर्टिकल में उन्होंने कहा कि हमें रूस के काफी सुविज्ञ लोगों ने बताया, जब वह प्रधान मंत्री जी के साथ गए थे, कि वहां रूस में लोग समझौता करने के लिए तैयार बैठे थे, लेकिन पता नहीं क्यों वह समझौता नहीं हुआ? मैं कोई आरोप नहीं लगा रहा हूँ, यशवंत सिन्हा जी बड़े आदमी हैं, वह आरोप लगा सकते हैं, मेरे मन में कौतुहल है, जिज्ञासा है, मैं जिज्ञासु की तरह जानना चाहता हूँ, आप मेरी जिज्ञासा को शांत कीजिए, मेरा मानना है कि मेरी यह जिज्ञासा कॉमरेड येचुरी जी की और वृंदा जी की भी होगी, कि रूस से समझौता क्यों नहीं हुआ?

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जहां तक ईरान के गैस प्रोजेक्ट का सवाल है, अभी ईरान के राजदूत हमसे मिलने आए थे। वह बहुत चिंतित थे, कह रहे थे कि हम चाहते हैं कि यह परिकल्पना पूरी हो जाए। हमारे बड़े विशेष मित्र मणि शंकर अय्यर जी जब पैट्रोलियम मिनिस्टर थे तो बहुत ज्यादा इसके लिए संकल्पित रहा करते थे, कालांतर में बड़ी शिथिलता दिखाई दे रही है और ईरान के राजदूत के हवाले से मैं कह रहा हूँ, बहुत दावे के साथ कह रहा हूँ, जो उन्होंने कहा कि ईरान गैस प्रोजेक्ट संभवतः शिथिल हो जाएगा, खत्म हो जाएगा। आपने अभी यह बात इशारे से कही और यशवंत सिन्हा जी ने नाम ही ले लिया कि एस्सार औद्योगिक समूह, जो ईरान में बड़ा व्यवसाय करने जा रहा था, अमरीकी दबाव के फलस्वरूप वहां से हट गया। यह ईरान गैस का प्रोजेक्ट खत्म हो रहा है, एस्सार, जो एक निजी औद्योगिक घराना है, उस पर दबाव डाला जा रहा है कि वह ईरान से काम न करे। आज अमरीकी इंटेलीजेन्स की रिपोर्ट आ गई है कि ईरान के ऊपर लगा हुआ आरोप * और बेबुनियाद है, लेकिन इसके बावजूद बिना किसी क्राइम के We have decided to punish Iran at the behest of the United States of America. हमने दो बार ईरान के खिलाफ वोट दे दिया। मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रहा, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बड़ा फैशन है न्यूक्लीयर रेनेसांस, न्यूक्लीयर बस की चर्चा हो रही है। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि यह कौन सा nuclear renaissance और nuclear bus है जो छूट रही है। 30 साल से अमरीका में कोई न्यूक्लिअर प्लांट नहीं आया और यहां की, अमरीका की GE कम्पनी अमरीका के बाहर न्यूक्लिअर प्लांट लगा रही है। एक भी न्यूक्लिअर प्लांट अमरीका में नहीं लगा। Mile Island disaster के बाद पिछले 30 साल से अमरीका में कोई न्यूक्लिअर प्लांट नहीं लगा है। हमारे यहां 60 हजार मैगावाट हाइड्रो पावर की क्षमता है और छोटे स्तर पर मेरी भी अपना विंड मिल और हाइड्रो पावर का ही काम है, बिजली और पानी खुद मुझको भी रोटी-पानी देते हैं, हवा-पानी से मेरा भी काम चल रहा है। इसलिए हवा-पानी के बारे में मुझसे अधिक किसको मालूम होगा — हाइड्रो पावर और विंड पावर। लेकिन, हाइड्रो पावर और विंड पावर जो 60 हजार मैगावाट का है, सिर्फ नार्थ-ईस्ट में काफी है, उसको हम एक्सप्लॉयट करने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं। लालू जी बैठे हैं, इतना पानी आता है कि उनका पटना डूब जाता है। अगर वे नेपाल में ही बांध बना दें और हाइड्रो पावर का कुछ काम कर दें, इधर भूटान और सिक्किम में कर दें, नार्थ-ईस्ट में कर दें, तो बहुत काम हो जाएगा। दूसरी बात, अगर आप इसे जानें भी दें तो हमारे पास कोयला इतना है, कोल बेस की मिथेन इतनी है, लिक्विफाइड कोल इतना है कि हमें न्यूक्लिअर एनर्जी की जरूरत नहीं है और यह सस्ता है, लेकिन हम अमरीका की बीमार न्यूक्लिअर इंडस्ट्री के लिए, GE कम्पनी के फायदे के लिए काम करने के लिए तैयार हैं। वहां की न्यूक्लिअर इंडस्ट्री बीमार है, सिक है, यह मैं नहीं कह रहा, यह वहां कोंडालिज़ा राइस का बयान है —The nuclear industry in America is sick.

अब यह कहा जा रहा है कि चीन का समर्थन है। शायद इसलिए कहा जा रहा है कि हमारे वामपंथी साथी चुप हो जाएं। लेकिन एक चीज़ हमें याद रखनी चाहिए कि चीन अपने आप में एक न्यूक्लिअर वीपन स्टेट है।

---

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

हाई टेबल पर बैठा है। न्यूक्लिअर व्हीपन स्टेट है और न्यूक्लिअर प्रोलिफ्रेशन ट्रीटी का एक पार्टी है और चीन और अमरीका का करार इंटरनेशनल लॉ से चलेगा, जबकि भारत और अमरीका के करार का निर्णय हाइड एक्ट और 123 एग्रीमेंट से होगा। हम अभी भी बहुत नीचे हैं, हमारा स्तर बहुत छोटा है और शायद इसीलिए इस तर्क के बावजूद कि चीन हमारा साथ दे रहा है, चीन हमारे साथ है, कॉमरेड कारत का एक बयान आया कि होगा चीन हमारे साथ, लेकिन अगर चीन भी हमारा साथ देगा तो हम इस करार का समर्थन नहीं कर सकते, क्योंकि यह करार देश के हित में नहीं है।

बात हो रही है India specific safeguard की, यह क्या है? हमारे फास्ट फीडर रिएक्टर IAEA एजेंसी की निगरानी में अनंतकाल तक रहेंगे, जबकि हमारे परमाणु वैज्ञानिकों के अनुसार हमारा फास्ट फीडर रिएक्टर दुनिया के कई देशों से बेहतर है। पश्चिमी देशों के लिए न्यूक्लिअर वेस्ट मैनेजमेंट एक बड़ी समस्या है, उनके मुकाबले हमारे लिए यह कोई समस्या नहीं है। लेकिन, फिर भी हम बहुत व्याकुल हैं कि यह एग्रीमेंट हो जाए !

वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, यह रि-प्रोसैसिंग क्या है? यह वास्तविकता है या नोशनल है? सरकार के मुताबिक हम इस spent fuel का इस्तेमाल कर सकते हैं। किसी ने सोचा है कि यह कितना cost effective है? सर, इन उलझनों में फंसकर WTO, G70, G77, G90 में हमें अपनी स्थिति नहीं बिगाड़नी चाहिए। चीन और ब्राजील के साथ मिलकर भारत अमरीकन एग्रीकल्चर सब्सिडी के खिलाफ लड़ रहा है और हम ईरान से लेकर WTO में संघर्षरत अपने साथी मुल्कों को छोड़कर अमरीका के आगे घुटने टेक रहे हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please conclude.

श्री अमर सिंह : इस डील के मुख्य उद्‌बोधक निकोलस बर्न वहां से कहते हैं कि 90 प्रतिशत भारत का सिविल न्यूक्लिअर रिएक्टर IAEA के माध्यम से सुपरविज़न में रहेगा और परपिच्युटी में रहेगा। यह क्या मज़ाक है? एकाएक अमरीका आबोहवा से इराक, ईरान, अफगानिस्तान, फिलिस्तीन और मिडल ईस्ट के संदर्भ में हमारी विदेश नीति बदल गई है और हम बुश साहब के नज़दीक हो गए हैं। मैं निकोलस बर्न जी को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूं, हृदय से बहुत धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूं, श्री अभिषेक मनु सिंघवी चाहे जितना बयान दे लें, भाई कपिल सिब्बल बयान दे लें ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री कपिल सिब्बल : मैं तो आज बोला भी नहीं।

श्री अमर सिंह : बाहर आपका बयान सुनते हैं। इस पर आपका बयान बहुत सुना है इसलिए आपको उद्धृत कर रहा हूं, आप नायक हैं इसके। आप इसके नायक हैं, आप प्रणेता हैं, आप ही सबका जवाब देते हैं। मैं Nicholas Burn को धन्यवाद देते हुए कहता हूं कि उन्होंने कहा कि यह Non-Proliferation Deal भारत को mainstream में लाकर खड़ा करती है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो.पी. जे. कुरियन): अब आप समाप्त कीजिए।

श्री अमर सिंह : यह उन्होंने मान लिया है, मैं तो कहना चाहता हूं कि Nicholas Burn * बोल रहे हैं, जब वे कह रहे हैं कि यह Hyde Act एकदम पक्की बात है, या Condoleezza Rice * बोल रही हैं, जब वे कह रही हैं कि यह हमारा न्यूक्लियर प्लांट, एक सिक इंडस्ट्री है, लेकिन हमारे कांग्रेस के साथी, UPA के साथी सच बोल रहे हैं। मैं तो उनसे इतना ही कहना चाहूंगा कि वे देश के हित में इस deal को आगे बढ़ने से एकदम रोक दें और कम से कम sense of House को समझें।

अंत में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि —

"मुमकिन है सफर हो आसान,
अब साथ भी चलकर देखें।
कुछ तुम भी बदलकर देखो,
कुछ हम भी बदलकर देखें।"

DR. V. MAITREYAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, this discussion is supposed to be completed in two-and-a-half hours. But the first five speakers themselves have taken two hours and fifty

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

minutes, and I am the sixth one. I request you to consider the remaining 28 speakers also with the same consideration which you have extended to the first five speakers, or, at least, to me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You will conclude in 12 minutes.

DR. V. MAITREYAN: Give me fifteen minutes. अगले 15 मिनट के लिए आप घंटी मत बजाइए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KARIEN): Your party has six minutes, and I am giving you 12 minutes. Anyway, you start now.

DR. V. MAITREYAN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am not like Sitaram Yechuryji, who is an ideologue. I am not like Shri Yashwant Sinha, who has mastered the 123 Agreement on his fingertips. I am not like Abhishek Singhviji, who, because of his legal acumen, tried to make a virtue out of a bad case. And, I can never be like Amar Singhji. I represent the *Aam Aadmi*, whom the Congress (I) and the UPA Government have forgotten. Today, the *Aam Aadmi* is worried. He is not bothered about the full-stops and commas of the 123 Agreement. He is not bothered about Section 106 or 104 of the Hyde Act. His concern is whether India will be able to explore a Pokharan — III. He is concerned as to whether the pride of place, which Mrs. Gandhi and Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee gave to India, will become a thing of the past. *Aam Aadmi* is concerned as to whether the country, which had a pride of place, in the Group of Non-aligned Nations, will today be under the dictates of the U.S. *Aam Aadmi* is concerned as to whether our country's sovereignty is going to be pledged. So, from that perspective, in the next few minutes, I will be placing my views. And, on behalf of the AIADMK, I oppose this Indo-U.S. nuclear deal with the full strength at my command. Various other parties also have opposed it. The NDA has opposed it. The UNPA has opposed it. The Left Front has opposed it. My party leader and the former Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, Madam Jayalalitha, is a very strong and vocal opponent of the nuclear deal. But I go one step further. I oppose not only this deal but also this debate, which is being held today, under Rule 176 without voting. My comrade friends have been repeatedly saying that political parties must be allowed to express their views in Parliament. All political parties have their stated positions with regard to this nuclear deal. The entire country knows this. In that case, if it is a question of merely the views of political parties, then, the various statements made by the political parties, for and against the deal, can be laid on the Table of the House, and be done away with. Again, it is being repeatedly said, *ad nauseum*, that the Government should ascertain the sense of the House. How do you do it? Is it on the basis of empty speeches? And how do you ascertain the sense of allies of the UPA? ये तो बड़े छिपे हुए रुस्तम हैं। Parties like DMK have supported the deal in the Cabinet, and they have opposed it outside, much to the embarrassment of the Prime Minister. In fact, he had to admonish them saying that it is the collective decision of the Cabinet...*(Interruptions)* The entire country knows it...*(Interruptions)* It is a collective decision of the Cabinet; it is not his baby alone and if the allies want, he is ready to go. The irony is, the allies who opposed the deal outside, have once again supported it in Lok Sabha. What sense can you make out of these things? Again, the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs, Shri Priyaranjan Dasmunsi, has gone on record to say that discussion on the nuclear deal should not be considered as the sense of the House and that the sense of the House cannot be ascertained on a debate which is held under Rule 176, and that a conclusion cannot be reached on a debate which has not been voted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You cannot question the decision of the Chairman.

DR. V. MAITREYAN: Sir, I am putting across my view-point and I am entitled to that. So, the House has been taken for a ride. आप क्या समझते हैं, इस सभा में जिस तरह चाहो, बजाओ, हम

आदमी नहीं हैं, हम झुनझुना हैं? Even though there is no voting, from the Members it is very clear that a majority in this House is opposed to the Indo-US Nuclear Deal. That is the sense of the House. That being the case, will the hon. Prime Minister, give an assurance to this House that he respects the sense of the House and would therefore, drop the Deal? It is said that international treaties between India and other countries do not need parliamentary ratification and hence, the notices for discussion under Rule 184 in the Lok Sabha and under Rule 168 in the Rajya Sabha are disallowed. That is why, my party leader, Ms. Jayalalitha, as early as in December 2006, had strongly advocated for a constitutional amendment providing for parliamentary ratification of every treaty entered into by the Executive with any other country. And it is not as though the Parliament has never before debated on any international treaty. We have read it in the newspapers: Parliamentary Debates of 1965 mention about voting on a motion by the then Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, on agreement between the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan relating to cease fire and the restoration of status quo on January 1st, 1965, in the Gujarat-West Pakistan border and the determination of the border in that area. Do you know what the then Speaker of Lok Sabha, Sardar Hukam Singh, had said. He said, "The Executive has every right to negotiate with the other Governments, if it has to administer the country. But, however, if the Parliament does not approve it and if the Government of the day cannot take the Parliament with it, then the Government has to go". But, here, we are told that this House has no competence to vote at the end of the debate. That is why, the AIDMK Party is very clear that the debate has to be necessarily followed by voting.

After the text of the Agreement was released on 1st August, Madam Jayalalitha had suggested that a committee consisting of Members of Parliament, eminent scientists and patriotic citizens should be constituted to examine the various clauses of the Agreement. We, the opposition parties here, demanded a JPC in the last Monsoon Session. The Government outrightly rejected both these demands and, instead, it formed its own UPA-Left Coordination Committee. After five rounds of discussion, the Committee could not come to any consensus. A Government which could not convince six members of the Left Front in the UPA-Left Committee, how can it convince more than 300 Members of Lok Sabha and nearly 130 to 140 Members of the Rajya Sabha who are opposed to this deal? The unmistaken message is that the UPA is very badly isolated as far as the nuclear deal is concerned. समझने वाले समझ गए, जो न समझे वे अनाड़ी हैं। The Prime Minister refuses to understand this reality. But the US understood it very well. That is why we saw the unsavoury spectacle of the open-market lobbying by the White House. Concerned at the ineptitude and helplessness of the UPA Government, the US Treasury Secretary, Henry Paulson, the former Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, the US Ambassador to India, David Mulford and others met the senior leaders of the opposition parties. You need not be surprised; if allowed, probably, they might even have addressed the Parliament Session also to sell a US-dictated deal. Such unrelenting US pressure on India and such open interference in our affairs is highly condemnable. If the US interferes in our affairs even before the Deal goes through, I shudder to imagine what might be the US diktats once the draconian provisions of the Hyde Act comes into effect.

Now, Sir, I shall explain, very briefly, some of the issues. I will not go into the details because, as I said, people are not concerned about it nowadays. Ever since Independence, successive Prime Ministers of our country have very clearly held the view that India should be self-reliant, as far as nuclear energy is concerned. There is no dearth of knowledge, equipment, raw material or recycling technology *vis-a-vis* the nuclear energy in India. The atom bomb is developed from the atomic waste. For India to emerge as a super-power in

5.00 P.M.

nuclear energy, the Atomic Energy Department should be made fully independent in its functions as well as it should be self-reliant. However, there are very deleterious clauses in this Agreement, which work against India's sovereignty. Our research centres, our atomic plants, our atomic power processing, *i.e.*, most of our atomic waste after use will all come under the supervisory control of the US. As also the provisions for the inspection and information-gathering, as far as this nuclear capability is concerned. Thus, America has positioned itself as a master *vis-a-vis* the Nuclear Agreement. The reason given by the Government that raw material for atomic plants in India is very scarce, is a very lame and feeble excuse, which is not convincing and not accepted by our scientists. It is very pertinent to point out here that the former President of our country, Dr. A.P.J. Abdul Kalam had mentioned about the use of thorium, which is available in plenty in the Southern coastal areas. Sir, in the Agreement, there are clauses enabling the US in interfering with regard to our future atomic research, raw material research and future production of atomic weaponry. This Nuclear Deal not only interferes with regard to the production of atom bomb for India's military purposes, but also with reference to the nuclear power plants for civilian use, because at every stage, there is some supervisory control. Hence, this Agreement cannot be considered as an Agreement between the two countries with equal status and rights.

Sir, in this Agreement, again, there are certain provisions which dictate how India should behave with other countries *vis-a-vis* the nuclear power. America has already shattered and swallowed Iraq. Because of the nuclear power programme, North Korea is being threatened day in and day out. There are reports of US trying to invade Iran. In this situation, why should India, out of our own volition, take over to the American over-lordship, thereby inviting danger to ourselves? Two recent incidents are worth-mentioning here. Of course, the Prime Minister gave the reply...(*Time-bell*) Sir, I said, '5.06', and definitely, I will conclude before that. Recently, the Prime Minister was on a visit to Russia. An agreement between the Government of India and the Government of Russia was ready, just to be inked. Suddenly, the Prime Minister seems to have backtracked. Why? He may deny it, but the country knows that it was because of the US pressure. Similarly, the ISRO was to launch a spy satellite for Israel on 3rd November. The satellite had reached ISRO. But, on the d-day, at the last minute, the launch was called off. The media reports linked this launch-cancellation to US pressure. The Nuclear Deal, if it goes through, will only make us *'ji-hazoors'* of the US-master. From the time the first atomic plant was set up in Tarapore, this was succeeded by various atomic plants, and all are functioning well. And, they bear testimony to the extraordinary achievement of the Indian scientists. The unpalatable truth of this Agreement is that America will not supply to India new methods in technology for production of materials for atomic power, raw material and heavy water used in the process, but will supply only finished products. That being so, where is the need for this Agreement?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please conclude.

DR. V. MAITREYAN: As India has already moved forward in the field of nuclear energy, our Indian scientists' research capacity could be eroded by this Deal, since India will become a consumer nation thwarting the research psyche. Why should US be allowed to inspect our nuclear plants? Will US allow us to inspect their nuclear plants? Thus, this Agreement is a master-slave charter, and not an agreement between two countries of equal status. And that is why Madam Jayalalitha and the AIADMK are strongly opposed to it. To conclude, the sense of the House is very clear and obvious. If the hon. Prime Minister is not able to read it, then the only course left to him is to ascertain the sense of the nation. For that, he has to go

to the people. अब जब आप चुनाव के मैदान में उतरेंगे तो आम आदमी आपका वहां इंतजार कर रहा है और वह आपको कहना चाहता है कि

मैं शाराह नहीं, रास्ते का पत्थर हूं।

यहां सवार भी पैदल उतर चलते हैं।

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we started with Mr. Sitaram Yechury, went through Mr. Yashwant Sinha, and this the fifth or the sixth speech that is being delivered. Sir, I was wondering with whom I should start. I have decided to follow the alphabetical order and Amar Singh tops the list. Sir, even he would vouch the feelings of friendship and affection that I have for him. Whatever he said about the deal, I will forgive because he said that he was educated by the Left. But, Sir, his message was very clear. That message.....

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, one second. According to the alphabetical order I will come at the last. Before that you please press the bell and ask him to sit down!

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I will really deal with you at the last! Sir, the message was that those whose duty it was to explain the deal have failed in their duty to explain it properly and adequately. Sir, I find great substance in what he said and I personally think that our very distinguished Minister should be present here, but his assistant is present here; he should take charge of his erstwhile pupil and properly educate him in the utility of this deal. But I admire Mr. Amar Singh for having kept his mind open because he says that he is subject to the effect of further education being imparted to him and, Mr. Amar Singh, thank you for that.

SHRI AMAR SINGH: No, Sir, I did not say that.*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I merely said that the message is clear. You do not understand.....

SHRI AMAR SINGH: Please do not misunderstand. I have said that this is not an honourable deal for the nation and that there was no communication at least of our side with the Government. The deal is not honourable for the nation.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I agree with you. This is exactly what I have said. The fault is with the Government which has not explained to you properly what this deal means.

Sir, everybody has been saying, taking into account the numbers, that the Government should heed the majority opinion in this House. Sir, it is true that Parliament is the political sovereign of this country. But it cannot be forgotten that ultimately there is another sovereign of this country who is superior to this legal sovereign and that is the people of India. My friend called it the *aam admi,* I accept his thesis of *aam admi,* but I do not accept his reading of the *aam admi's* mind. I am sure, he is not in touch with the *aam admi* at all.*(Interruptions)*

DR. V. MAITREYAN: But, about Pokhran.....

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: You are right, we will talk of Pokhran-III in 4 or 5 minutes. I do not know how you got this infection from them! *(Interruptions)* But, Sir, if people think or any political party thinks, that this deal is very detrimental to the nation, that it means complete surrender of sovereignty, India becoming subordinate of the U.S., they should be prepared to go to the people of India. You cannot say to the BJP, like Sitaram said this morning that you are trying to ride piggy-back and to get into that position. Of course, Sir, everybody wants to get into that position. Even Sitaram wants one day, if he can he will do it.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: With your help!

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: You will need my help...*(Interruptions)*... If you are in the right line, you will always have my help and on good issues you will always have my help. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, therefore, nobody on a matter of vital importance like this should suppress his real conscience and think about whether it will mean dissolution of the House or whether it will mean going to the people. After all, elections are going to take place in this country in 2009 and, Sir, if they take place a year earlier, I do not think it is going to be a great loss for this country. But, Sir, democracy would have succeeded. Let us see whom the *aam aadmi* of this country supports. If people were sure of what the *aam aadmi* is doing, they would have seen to it that the House is dissolved. But nobody wants dissolution because nobody is sure what *aam aadmi* is going to do ultimately. Sir, there are some basic facts which must be understood. Who went about looking for nuclear know-how and nuclear fuel? Didn't the Americans come to you and say, "Please take from us nuclear know-how or nuclear fuel"? Or were we going round the world and did not succeed in getting what we wanted to buy in the market? Sir, I regret that I have to utilise for my argument something which my very, very dear friend Jaswant said in an article which appeared on the 10th of December, 2003 in the *Indian Express* and I hope that my friend will recall that he had written that article. "The irony is that our concerns regarding non-proliferation, environmental degradation, nuclear safety and so on are no different from those of the Nuclear Suppliers Group, NSG." This was an appeal to the NSG that please lift these restrictions which all 45 of you have imposed upon this country and denying us nuclear know-how, nuclear fuel for the purpose of production of electricity which will allow our industry to go on, will allow us to compete in this WTO and globalisation phenomenon that is taking place. In a world of tremendous competition we are not able to compete. Our industry will come to an end. That is why we went to the NSG and this is an appeal from the BJP leadership to the NSG. What comes in the way is the issue of our nuclear weapons acquired for our security. Without violating any international law or our own commitment to it, Sir, I have no doubt at all, he was absolutely right that when in 1974 we had an explosion or in 1998 when we had our other nuclear explosion, Sir, we had not committed a breach of any treaty obligation because we had not signed the NPT at all and we were under no obligation of any kind. Whatever weapons we had acquired was the work of our scientists for which they need to be complimented. Sir, we had committed no breach of any law. But, now, Sir, if human development of a billion people and the market it represents for developed economies has to progress, in other words, if the human development of India has to go on with any sense of priority, then a fresh look at the question of access to clean, affordable nuclear energy becomes an imperative. This was an appeal to the suppliers of the world, 45 of them, including Russia. Sir, it is true that Russians have been our friends. The Russians did breach the sanctions, which were imposed upon us for our benefit. But it was a pittance. They supplied to us, —Sir, if somebody who is in a position to deny this statement of mine — at some long intervals thousand kilograms of heavy water at a time, that is all the help that we received from our Russian friends for all that we have done for the Soviet Union in the past. But, Sir, even they did not cooperate because they too are a nuclear power and they belong to the club of nuclear powers, the first ones who control the entire nuclear wherewithal of the whole world. This would require some changes in the working guidelines of the suppliers to deal with issues on a case-by-case basis. India, obviously, — Sir, please understand this line, I want the BJP Members to be reminded of this; this is a statement by your great representative — would have no objection to placing such reactors under international inspection and safeguards at length. Sir, I do not wish to say more. I spent the whole of yesterday in the

library going through the speech of the Leader of the Opposition in the Lok Sabha. I presume, Mr. Yashwant Sinha, is not striking out a new line of thought. Sir, that speech contains five elements two of which I fully agree with. His first was, 'we are not against any strategic partnership with the US'. So, Sir, my friend Amar Singh is wrong that this Government has succeeded in making Sitaram, Amar Singh and Yashwant Sinha speak with one voice. There are different voices but on some points, you are using only a similarity of words but your ideas, your philosophy and what you intend to convey to the people of this country are totally in contradiction because the BJP says that we are not against any strategic partnership with the US. My friend Sitaram would never accept this proposition; nor would Amar Singh with his education coming from these two sources.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: I actually said so, that they are strategic partnership legislators.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I have a little bit of knowledge of English. So, I understand what is going on in the House. Secondly, he said that the Left and the UPA Committee which has been formed for this purpose are useless. I entirely agree. How would they arrive at the solution of the problem? Their positions are well known. Their ideologies are well known. They are not going to flinch from these ideologies ever. They will have to be reincarnated before they do it and, Sir, I agree that they are also entitled to cling on to their ideologies however outdated they are. But, the BJP leaders are right that this Committee which has been formed is a surplus, is a redundancy, is thoroughly useless. It will achieve no purpose. It was not intended to reach any confusion at all. Sir, then, the third point, which he made, was Pokhran III with which my friends here are impressed. Sir, I have gone through the deal, the 123 deal, word by word, not once, but ten times. I have studied it and I have studied it as I would study my text book in the law examination. Nowhere does the 123 agreement, at all, say that you cannot have your Pokhran III. All that it says is that if and when, in your wisdom, you decide to connect Pokhran III, we will also exercise our sovereignty. We are also a sovereign nation. We are also equal partners. If you have a right to explode a bomb, we will also have the right to say that hereafter, we won't give your supplies. Nothing at all. What it means is that you will go back to the same position in which you are in the year 2007, the month of November or December. That is all ...*(Interruptions)*...Now, I wish to ask a question. And, this is a question which has got to be answered with all conscience and with all candour. When we did the Pokhran-II, why did you, within the next one week, announce to the whole world, a unilateral moratorium on further tests? Who asked you to do it? You knew that no tests are necessary at this time. You don't want more nuclear power to combat Pakistan. Pakistan is too weak. We don't have to make any preparation. In conventional forces, we are ten times superior to Pakistan. Pakistan, today, is almost a failed State, a phenomenon which I don't enjoy. I want Pakistan to grow in prosperity and strength so that we have good friends and powerful friends on our side, but not hostile friends. But, Sir, Pakistan has hardly anything. They have got some stolen technology. Mr. Quadir Khan went and stole from his Dutch employer. He brought it here. He then borrowed something from China. The Chinese gave Pakistan a nuclear know-how. At that time, nobody protested against China. But, Sir, that is the way of world.

Sir, when do you — Mr. Yashwant Sinha is not here, he should answer this question to his conscience or, at least, to the people of India — propose to enact this Pokhran-III? When? Against whom? Not against Pakistan. Pakistan is too weak to deserve that kind of an attention. Are you going to do it against China? Does the Left want that one day we will have fight with China...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHAHID SIDDIQUI: That is not against anybody ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No. Mr. Siddiqui ...*(Interruptions)*...You can reply when your turn comes ...*(Interruptions)*...No interruptions, please...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: You don't make atomic and nuclear weapons for the joy of keeping them. They are not toys to be kept in a children's nursery. They are meant for war. They are meant either for a defensive war or for an aggressive war. They are for war, war and war. It is not a toy to keep in a children's nursery.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, will you yield for a minute?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I will yield ten times for you.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, Mr. Jethmalani has said that Left endorsed it. Let me put the record straight that we had opposed the Pokhran-II. We do not want nuclear weapons not only in India but anywhere in the world. We want universal disarmament. We do not want nuclear weapons with the USA, with China, with Russia, or with India. We do not want them anywhere.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sitaram, did I ever charge you with inconsistency? Your trouble is too much consistency. You will not change.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Definitely; I will change for the better.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Now, Sir, I do not envisage that in the near future that we need to have any atomic or nuclear weapons. If that situation arises, be sure, that the world democracies will come to our help and we will not have to rely on our own strength.

Sir, let us not forget some inconvenient facts of history. We were attacked in 1962. It was the most humiliating aggression committed against us. Read the Resolution of Parliament which was passed after 1962. All Members of both the Houses unanimously passed a Resolution in which we have said that India is the victim of unprovoked aggression. 93,000 sq. miles of our territory is under the possession of Chinese. And, no Indian shall rest until the last square inch is obtained from Chinese and regained from Chinese. Sir, not only have we not been able to get one square inch from Chinese, but, today, we have totally surrendered our markets to the Chinese and there is nobody to protest against this economic aggression which is going on. Our markets have been taken over. But, we are a nation in which our Ministers of Defence make excuses for acts of aggression against us. The worthy newspapers report that there have been attacks and aggressive attacks in Arunachal Pradesh. And, our Minister says that these are as a result of the misunderstanding about the border. What misunderstanding about the border? Why do you want to make excuses for the Chinese? Have we also, by mistake, gone into their territory? Why is it that they are, all the time, coming into our territory? Why is there nobody to protest against what China is doing to us? On the contrary, we are only and only protecting Chinese interests in this House, and not the Indian interests at all. Sir, China is too powerful for us to run a nuclear race with them. We cannot do it. The Russian's bankrupted themselves, and brought about an end of the Soviet Empire by trying to run a nuclear race with the Americans. If we do that, the same fate will overtake us. Our security lies in a fact which was propounded as far back as 200 years ago by the German Immanuel Kant that democracies of the world must unite; only when the world becomes democratic, and democracies put their moral, spiritual and physical resources together, then, the world will be safe from aggression and war.

And, Sir, for the first time, I am sorry to digress. That smirk on your face titillates me a little. Sir, you remember that Leonardo da Vinci produced his masterpiece called, 'Mona Lisa.' It is now in the Louvre Museum in Paris. I hope hon. Members have had the good fortune to have

a look at it. Sir, there was some novice who did not know anything about art; some novice like me. I have nothing at all of artist in me. I have examined the seven-generation family tree of mine, there has not been one painter. But, Sir, a novice, a fool like me, went over to Leonardo Da Vinci and said that I want you to repaint this picture. He said, 'Do you want me to repaint this picture?' What is it that you want me to change? He said, "I want to get rid of that smirk; that smile on the face of Mona Lisa." And, it is the smile, Sir, which has titillated millions of human beings. It is a smile which has excited millions of people the world over; the lovers of art and aesthetics. But, Sir, a fool like me said, "I want this to be repainted again." And, the BJP leadership says the same thing. We like this deal, but, we want it to be renegotiated so that it should not be the product of Manmohan Singh; it should not be the product of Manmohan Singh painting. It should not be the real Leonardo who deserved credit for it; but, somebody, who wants to repaint the Mona Lisa. Sir, I have said before, and I wish to repeat it that nothing better has happened in the history of India for the last 50 years that this deal ..*(Interruptions)*..

श्री लालू प्रसाद: सर, हम अपने दल की तरफ से राम जेठमलानी जी को अपना पूरा टाइम देते हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No; please sit down. ..*(Interruptions)*.. Yes, you speak please. ...*(Interruptions)*... उनका टाइम भी इनको मिल गया ...**(व्यवधान)**... नहीं, नहीं। इनका टाइम भी इनको मिल गया। ...**(व्यवधान)**... इस पार्टी का टाइम भी इनको दे दिया गया। ...**(व्यवधान)**... आप बैठिए। ...**(व्यवधान)**... Mr. Jothi, sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...

प्रो. राम देव भंडारी : जिनको पाँच मिनट का टाइम था, उनको 20 मिनट बोलने दिया गया, तो इनको क्यों नहीं बोलने देते हैं? ...**(व्यवधान)**... सब लोगों ने बहुत बोला है, सर। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): RJD Party's time is also given to you. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Jothi, please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Why have you become so chicken-hearted today? ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Jothi, there is no time. ..*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Ram Jethmalani, please continue and try to wind up also. Please continue. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, a question is being asked today. Why have the Americans suddenly become friendly to India? It is because, Sir, the criticism that has been made of the poor Americans throughout the world...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Sir, poor Americans, poor Bush! ..*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): That is his terminology...*(Interruptions)*... Please, please. That is his terminology. Don't worry about that. ..*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, it is true that Mr. Bush is not popular in his own country.

AN HON. MEMBER: Like you...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I don't care.*(Interruptions)*. At this age, I don't need popularity. ..*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Jothi, don't make such comments please ...*(Interruptions)*... Please don't make such comments. Now, Mr. Jethmalani, please proceed. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: When you could not get from the Nuclear Suppliers Group, it is interesting to know that in 1998, then, again, in 1999, then, in 2000, on the occasion of Clinton's visit, it was conveyed to him by Shri Jaswant Singh who was put in charge of negotiations with the USA, that Prime Minister Vajpayee had made an irreversible decision to sign the CTBT. It was the question of how and when to make that decision public. Always pleading that they were only worried about the political management of that decision. So, Sir, so far as the BJP is concerned, be sure, that they are not the real opponents of the Deal at all. They like this Deal; that is why, they say, "We want to renegotiate the Deal." " We want to renegotiate the deal means" nothing at all; this is just power politics which is going on. Sir, I am glad that Shri Yashwant Sinha has now arrived. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: What is your politics, Ram? You are always in the middle. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: No, never; my politics is very clear. I am an inveterate, undoubted, friend of the United States. ...*(Interruptions)*... Because the United States is a democracy. ...*(Interruptions)*... It is a democracy. Its ...*(Interruptions)*... human rights, its constitutional values are the constitutional values of India. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI N. JOTHI: Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please, please.*(Interruptions)*.. Mr. Jothi, please take your seat. That is his position.*(Interruptions)*. Why do you worry? *(Interruptions)*.. That is his position.*(Interruptions)*. See, you can be anti-American; he can be pro-American.*(Interruptions)*.. Please, please. Mr. Siddiqui. ...*(Interruptions)*... There is paucity of time. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I don't ...*(Interruptions)*... I don't pretend. *(Interruptions)*. I am an open book. *(Interruptions)*...

DR. V. MAITREYAN: Sir, within minutes, Mr. Jothi will speak. *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Do you want to give your time to Mr. Jothi? *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ARUN SHOURIE: Actually speaking, Sir, Mr. Ram Jethmalani is only obeying the rules of the House, which require that if we have an interest in a matter, we must declare it first. So, he is declaring his interest. He is an inveterate supporter. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: The only thing is that I have always been complaining that in this country there are private pornographers who pretend to be public purists. *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, please come to the subject.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, I am being diverted from all sides. *(Interruptions)*... Sir, position is very clear that when we were attacked in 1962, there were only two countries h, within the next 48 hours, gave us moral, military, diplomatic support and one of them merica. No Communist country supported us at that time. No non-secular country has ted us at this time. We have reason to be grateful because American planes and thal landed at Delhi Airport within 48 hours of that. *(Interruptions)*...

ICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please, please. *(Interruptions)*...

OOQ ABDULLAH (Jammu & Kashmir): What about Bagdad Pact? What about hat about SEATO? Were they in favour of India? *(Interruptions)*...